

BULLETIN OF
THE JOHN RYLANDS
LIBRARY
MANCHESTER
Edited by the Librarian

VOL. 38

MARCH, 1956

No. 2

NOTES AND NEWS

IN OCTOBER the Library received from the National Art-Collections Fund the gift of an illuminated manuscript containing the Statutes of the Order of S. Michel, bequeathed by E. E. Cook, Esq., of Bath. The Order of S. Michel was founded at Amboise on 1 August 1469 by Louis XI, the original statutes numbering sixty-six; to these, additions were made in 1476 when the king appointed a "Preuost maistre des serimonyes" to the Order. The present volume, which bears the title *Le liure de l'ordre du treschrestien Roy de France Loys XI^{me} à l'honneur de Sainct Michel*, contains all these statutes, written in a fine bâtarde hand on thirty-six leaves of vellum, with initials and line-filers executed in gold, blue, red, and green. It is illustrated by two miniatures. One, which fills the page (fol. 1^v) preceding the chapter list, depicts the Archangel Michael, sword in hand, in triumph over the Devil. The other, which heads the 1469 statutes (fol. 7^v), shows a meeting of the knights under the presidency of the king, presumably Henry II; an illustration of this is given as the frontispiece to the present volume. Both subjects, which are traditional, show in their treatment stylistic affinities with the miniatures in the copy of the statutes now at St. Germain-en-Laye, executed about 1548 for the Chancellor of the Order, Cardinal Charles de Lorraine. Even more striking are the similarities between the second miniature in the Rylands manuscript and the corresponding illuminated page in the copy (now in the Public Record Office) sent to Henry VIII by Francis I of France, with the knights grouped round the king and a white greyhound in the foreground, a feature also of the Fouquet copy

A MS. OF THE
STATUTES OF
THE ORDER
OF S. MICHEL.

of the statutes apparently made for Louis XI, which is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale and is now being exhibited there in the current "Exposition des Manuscrits à Peintures". This second miniature has a further interest, for Comte Paul Durrieu has seen in the beardless figure second on the king's left a representation of Edward VI of England and, for this and other reasons, is of the opinion that this is the volume which Henry II had executed for Edward VI when the latter became a member of the Order in July 1551 (*Bull. de la Société Française de Reproductions de Manuscrits à Peintures*, 1^{re} Année (1911), pp. 38-41). The high standard of craftsmanship could also be adduced in favour of such an attribution, a factor emphasized by comparison with copies made for other knights of the Order; for example, the one, also sixteenth century, prepared for Charles de Bourbon, Duc de Vendôme (now Ryl. French MS. 86), which, in spite of the importance of its owner, hardly compares favourably in artistic merit with the present volume.

From the eighteenth century onwards the provenance has been fairly well established. The manuscript has, in fact, passed through the hands of some distinguished bibliophiles. The first of these to be recorded is François-Roger de Gaignières (d. 1715). Later in the century it probably belonged to the Clairambaults and after 1755 was acquired by Louis-Jean Gaignat (d. 1768), at whose sale in April 1769, it was purchased for the Duc de la Vallière; it was no. 5293 in his sale at Paris in January 1784. After 1811 it came into the possession of Count Alexis Golovkine, whose bookplate it contains, and before 1816 was sold to Prince Michael Petrovitch Galitzine, in whose sale at Paris in March 1825 it was no. 170. In 1908 it was exhibited by the Burlington Fine Arts Club, at which time it was in the famous Holford Library. Subsequently it was acquired by Mr. A. Chester Beatty, remaining in his possession until 1933, when it was purchased for Mr. Cook.

The binding is eighteenth century French red morocco, with a fine dentelle border in which Derome's bird-tool occurs six times on each side.

The Library is greatly indebted to the National Art-Collections Fund for this valuable gift.

In the preceding BULLETIN (Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 2-3) an account was given of a collection of 500 letters and papers, mainly of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, added by the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres to the Scottish muniments which he deposited in the Library in 1946. In November Lord Crawford made a further addition to this collection, consisting of over 1,000 documents and twenty-seven manuscript volumes. The new accession forms a most valuable supplement to the earlier one. It contains, for example, further papers of Lord Menmuir (d. 1598), Keeper of the Privy Seal and Secretary of State to James VI, which include, among other items of interest, two letters to him from the king (1585, 1589), a letter from Sigismund of Poland (1597), miscellaneous parliamentary papers (mostly of 1587), a commission to the Octavians (1595), and a record of "Cheif headeis of the conference betwixt the King's Ma^te and Secretarie Walsingham, Ambassadour to the Quene of England" (1583), with the king's answer; the parliamentary papers are of particular note in view of Lord Menmuir's concern with the Acts respecting the constitution of the Scottish Parliament. Another, larger, group of state papers is found among the records of David Lindsay, 1st Lord Lindsay of Balcarres (d. 1641). These comprise financial, military and political documents relating to events in Scotland in the 1620's and 1630's, and particularly to the background of the Second Bishops' War and the Treaty of Ripon. Much other correspondence of the same century also occurs, notably a small group of royal (Stuart) letters, mostly of the 1650's and 1660's, the majority written to Anna, Countess of Balcarres by Charles II, his mother Henrietta Maria, and his sister Mary (Princess of Orange), and James, Duke of York (afterwards James II) and his wife Anne; among the papers associated with them is one containing "Privat instructions" sent by Charles II in 1654 to Alexander, 1st Earl of Balcarres, to enlist aid from the French king and the Protestants of that country. Sir David Lindsay of Edzell, Lord Edzell, is represented by over two hundred letters (late sixteenth and early seventeenth century), personal and business in the main although some interesting news-letters occur, and Colin, 3rd Earl

MUNIMENTS
OF THE EARL
OF CRAWFORD

of Balcarres (d. 1722), by a bundle of documents of which the bulk deals with Customs affairs. The collection includes, too, correspondence of Catherine, Countess of Crawford, dating from the 1560's and 1570's, and many miscellaneous papers, notes, verses and political squibs of Alexander, 6th Earl of Balcarres (d. 1825). A rather unusual group of letters and documents is that relating to the "coal works" in Fife in the mid-eighteenth century.

A number of bundles contain deeds of title, estate accounts and allied records concerning the family estates from the fifteenth century to the eighteenth, the largest groups relating to Balcarres (fifteenth-sixteenth century) and Kilconquhar (sixteenth-eighteenth century); the earliest single item is a thirteenth century confirmation by David de Lindsay to the church of Holy Cross, Edinburgh, of lands granted by Richard Cumin. Other estate records occur among the manuscript volumes, such as an "Inventory of the Evidences of the Earldom of Crawford and House of Edzell" (1571), a "Register of Tacks" of the Balcarres estate (1624), a rental of Edzell and Lethnot (1672-99), and a "Register of Feu Charters" (1706-22). The remaining manuscript volumes are of wider and more general interest. They include, for example, "A Defence of the Honorable Sentence and Execution of [Mary], the Queene of Scots"; "The Staggering State of the Scots Statesmen [1550-1650], to witt Chancellors, Secretars, Treasurers, and their Deputes"; "The Earl of Balcarres' Memoir [1685-1688]", being "a short view of your affairs in Scotland since the beginning of the revolution", presented to James II at St. Germain; and scientific, legal and theological note-books and tracts in the hand of David Lindsay, 1st Lord Lindsay of Balcarres (d. 1641), many of them alchemical. Finally, but not the least interesting, are thirteen inventories of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of which eight are of books and one, dated 9 February 1601, is an "Inventar of insicht, plenessing and utheris being in Balcarres".

An important addition to the documents in the Library's Charter Rooms of monastic interest or provenance was made in September when the Very Rev. Fr. Norbert E. Cowin, O.S.B., Prior of Pluscarden, deposited with us fourteen charters, including twelve of the earliest surviving records (1233-1551) of that house.

EARLY
CHARTERS OF
PLUSCARDEN
PRIORY

Pluscarden Priory was founded by Alexander II, King of Scots, in 1230, six miles from Elgin in Morayshire, for monks of the Valliscaulian Order, whose mother-house, that of Val-des-Choux in Burgundy, had only been established for some thirty years when it sent its Rule into Scotland. The only other foundations of this Order outside France were also in Scotland, at Beauly in Inverness and Ardchattan in Argyll. Both dated from the same year (1230) but, unlike Pluscarden, were not of royal foundation, Beauly being founded by Sir John Bisset, Lord of the Aird, and Ardchattan by Sir Duncan Macdougal of Lorn. All the Valliscaulian houses were dedicated to St. Mary and St. John the Baptist and all ranked as priories, including the mother-house. The Rule was drawn partly from the Carthusian and partly from the Cistercian observance.

The documents now deposited include the oldest surviving charter of the house—a confirmation of 1233 by Andrew, Bishop of Moray, of grants made to Pluscarden by Alexander II—as well as that king's second charter (7 April 1236), a quitclaim of tithes of certain mills made by the Bishop the following year, and a writ of David II to the sheriffs of Elgin and Forres in favour of Pluscarden dated 19 May 1367. The foundation charter itself has apparently not survived, but among the earlier items in the collection is a transumpt "actum anno gracie m^occ^oxl pridie Kalendas Maii in Sinodo celebrata in ecclesia Sancti Egidii de Elgin ", from which we may learn something of it; this unusual document, which has been discussed by Macphail (*Hist. of the Religious House of Pluscardyn* (1881), pp. 67 ff.), purports to include the essentials of all charters granted during the first ten years of the monastery's existence. Two other transumps, both of 1551, may also be mentioned, for one incorporates a copy of the Bull of 1454 by which Nicholas V provided for the union of the Benedictine Priory of Urquhart (which then had only two resident Brethren) and Pluscarden, under the charge of the royal Abbey of Dunfermline, and the other details the commission of Pope Paul III in 1535 to the Abbot of Ferne and others to act as judges in a claim made by Pluscarden for exemption from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Moray. Among the remaining items are transumps of two documents already

mentioned, the charter of 1233 and the royal writ of 1367, made when they were exhibited by Prior Robert in 1507 and Prior Andrew Haag in 1449, respectively; records of 1495 and 1524 concerning disputes about mills; and an appointment (1500) of Sir James Dunbar as a bailie of the Priory for life. Also included are two precepts (1559 and 1565) of Walter, the Abbot, and the Convent of Kinloss to their bailies to give seisin of certain lands.

During the month of January the Library participated in the world-wide celebration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. In two of the exhibition cases in the Main Library a selection of printed and manuscript material was arranged illustrating the many-sided career of the remarkable man who, in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, is described as "printer, author, philanthropist, inventor, statesman, diplomat, scientist". Since the great statesman delighted to style himself "Benjamin Franklin, printer", the place of honour was given to one of the productions of his press in Philadelphia, *M. T. Cicero's Cato Major, or his discourse of Old-Age . . . Philadelphia: printed and sold by B. Franklin, MDCCXLIV.* The translation was by James Logan, Chief Justice of Pennsylvania, and Franklin, in a prefatory note, expresses the "hearty Wish, that this first translation of a Classic in this Western World, may be followed with many others, performed with equal Judgment and Success; and be a happy Omen, that Philadelphia shall become the Seat of the American Muses". Alongside this volume lay an issue of *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, the newspaper of which Franklin became sole proprietor when he assumed complete control of the printing business of Meredith and Franklin in 1730. It bears the imprint, "Philadelphia: Printed by B. Franklin, postmaster, and D. Hall, at the New Printing Office, near the Market". Among other printed books exhibited were several of the many pamphlets written by Franklin through which he exercised a great influence in political affairs in America, Great Britain and France. Of peculiarly Manchester interest was a copy, formerly in the Portico Library, of a Royal Society paper

BENJAMIN
FRANKLIN,
1706-1790

by Thomas Percival, physician, *Of population in Manchester, and other adjacent places*. Percival was a prominent member of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, of which Franklin was a corresponding member and to which the celebration Congressional Medal was presented. In thanking Percival for his gift, of which very few copies were printed, Franklin comments (Federal Edition, vi. 216-17) on the great difference between the death-rate in Manchester and in nearby Morton (i.e. Monton), then a village of about 300 inhabitants, a difference which he attributed to "the unwholesomeness of the manufacturing life".

The most interesting item exhibited was a letter written on 2 July 1756, to George Whitefield, the Methodist leader who, a few months earlier, had returned to England from the fifth of his evangelising tours in America. "I sometimes wish", writes Franklin, "that you and I were jointly employ'd by the Crown to settle a Colony in the Ohio". "But", he says later in the letter, "I fear we shall never be call'd upon for such a Service." At the age of fifty, with little more than half his life passed, he writes, "Being now in the last Act, I begin to cast about for something fit to end with", and "in such an Enterprise I could spend the remainder of my Life with Pleasure". Far greater calls were made on him and, twenty years later, he was to receive a magnificent welcome in France when he commenced his nine years' stay as representative of the American people.

Acquisitions by purchase during the latter half of 1955 have been restricted for the most part to current publications and to the completion of defective sets. Special mention may, however, be made of a collection purchased from Mr. E. Mitford Abraham, late of Swarthmoor Hall, Ulverston. Mr. Abraham has, for over fifty years, been keenly interested in the history and distribution of wind-mills, and during that time has collected books on and newspaper cuttings relating to the subject. The collection acquired comprises some forty volumes on wind-mills and seven large portfolios of newspaper cuttings which contain invaluable accounts of wind-mills, many of which no longer exist. In the

PRINTED
BOOKS:
ACQUISITIONS
BY
PURCHASE

course of his researches, Mr. Abraham has visited and made photographs of wind-mills in various parts of the country, and has classified and mounted his prints in forty-seven albums. Of great value, also, are the notes which he has written on each of the mills visited ; a typewritten copy of the notes accompanies the albums. The negatives from which the prints were made are preserved with this collection, probably the most complete in existence relating to these striking features of the English countryside.

Later in these Notes will be found lists of the individuals and institutions who have, during the last half year, enriched the Library by their gifts. One recent gift of which special mention may be made is a copy of *Reformationis monastice vindicie seu defensio*, by Gui Jouenneaux, published by Engelbert and Godfrey de Marnef in July 1503. It is a valuable little text for monastic history. Gui Jouenneaux, or Guido Juvenalis, belongs to a group of serious-minded French humanists, which included Charles and Jean Fernand, of the generation before Erasmus. Gui wrote on Terence and on Laurentius Valla and produced a volume of *Epistolae* for the instruction of the young. But, from being concerned in the reform of Latinity, he came to be absorbed in the cause of monastic reform. It was as abbot of S. Sulpice, Bourges, reformed from Chezal-Benoît, that he wrote his *Vindication or defence of monastic reform*. It is arranged in three books ; a commendatory poem by Jean Fernand is pre-fixed, and the work is dedicated to the Parlement (*senatus*) of Paris. The rule of S. Benedict had been overlaid with many mitigating customs, which were being defended by monks of lax observance, even to the point of appeals addressed to Parliament. Gui, who himself translated the Rule into French, vigorously opposes relaxation, and in the course of his truly vindictive *Defence* throws interesting light upon the ideas and conduct of the unreformed monks. His book was never reprinted, and is somewhat rare.

PRINTED
BOOKS:
ACCESSIONS
BY GIFT

Of particular interest is a gift from Mr. Charles Ramsden, a copy of *Fables de La Fontaine*, Paris, P. Didot l'Aîné, an VII

[i.e. 1799], in two volumes, 12mo. These volumes at one time formed part of the Spencer collection and still bear the Spencer accession number on the flyleaf. In the first volume is a note "1821-April 18.—Presented to me by the Rt. Honble. Lavinia Countess Spencer. Chas. Hatchett." Hatchett, son of a Long Acre coachbuilder, was a chemist of some distinction, elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1797, and a member of the Literary Club, of which he was later treasurer, in 1809. It would appear that the books were discarded from the Spencer collection on the acquisition of what was assumed to be another copy, in an identical red morocco binding. This was not so, however; they are of two variant editions, and it is a most happy thought of Mr. Ramsden's to return the volumes to their place in the Spencer collection.

The most considerable individual gift was that of Mr. T. S. Blakeney, who presented all the works of his father, the late Edward Henry Blakeney, which were not already in the Library. The gift comprises twenty-nine volumes, and includes editions of classical and Biblical texts. The major portion of the collection, however, consists of volumes of verse written by Blakeney and issued between 1893 and 1949. The earlier volumes were printed for the author by Sutton and Goodchild at Ramsgate, and by the Gresham, Chiswick and Pear Tree Presses. Later Blakeney became interested in printing and from 1919 onwards produced volumes of his verses on his own press, first at King's School, Ely, and later at Winchester. Included in the gift are five books printed by him at Ely, and eight printed at Winchester, which form an important addition to the Library's collection of the productions of private presses.

The beginnings of printing presses are always of interest, and Dr. D. M. Dunlop of Cambridge University has drawn our attention to an account of the birth of a rare Syriac press. He writes:—

"The library of Dr. R. Regensburger in Cambridge contains a rare Syriac printed Psalter, which is not mentioned in the British Museum Catalogue or in Dr. Moule's Catalogue of Printed Bibles. The book is a small

A
LITTLE-
KNOWN
ORIENTAL
PRINTING
PRESS

octavo in the Ser̄ta character, giving the Peshiṭta Syriac version of the Psalms. A preface and colophon in Karshūnī (Arabic in Syriac characters) offer interesting notices of a little-known Oriental printing-press. The translation is as follows :

"A. [Preface, but no heading] : 'And when it was in A.D. 1843 I, the poor man, Metropolitan Ya'qūb, Metropolitan of Jerusalem, came to Constantinople. And we took a house of prayer and worship, and we collected our sect, the Syrians, who were dispersed and scattered in Constantinople, and after that we taught children of the sect of the Armenians the reading of Syriac. And in the year 1844 we began to make type in Syriac, and in the year 1845 we printed the book, "Preparation for Prayer". And in the year 1846 we have printed the book of the Psalms of David, the King and Prophet, 1000 copies. And if God wills, gradually the Syriac books will be printed. And God, Who has begun, will bring to completion, by His mercy. Amen.'

"B. [Colophon, also without heading] : 'This holy book, that is, the Psalms of David, the Prophet and King, has been printed in the guarded city of Constantinople from the hand of our weakness—I, the humble, Metropolitan Ya'qūb Jrijūryūs [Jacob Gregorius], Metropolitan of al-Quds ash-Sharīf [i.e. Jerusalem]. And this is the second book we have printed, because a year ago we printed the book, "Preparation for Mental Prayer" in another printing-press. And now we have got the printing-frame, its tools, and the type. It has been necessary for us to erect the printing-press in our house which we took for prayer and worship and for assembling the children of our sect, the Syrians who are in Constantinople. And we, the weak, were setting up the type, and our blessed children, Ūnanyas [Onanias] and Badrūs [Peter], sons of the Armenians, whom we taught Syriac, were helping us therein, and the priest Yūhannā al-Urfalī was folding the paper, and Antūn, head of the printing-press of the sect of the Greeks, was printing, and my holy Shim'ūn al-Bātawī from Jabal al-'Abidin was giving the ink. And that was in A.D. 1846, in the time of the chief priest, our lord Mār Ijnātyūs [Ignatius] who sits on the throne of Antioch, the Patriarch Ilyās [Elias]. We hope that every father or brother who reads in this holy book will pray for mercy'

on us, and on our teacher, priest Jibrā'il [Gabriel] and on our parents, Yūsuf [Joseph] and Hānnā. Amen.'

"These notices tell their own story, and little is necessary in the way of comment. The press in Constantinople evidently belonged to the Jacobites (Monophysites), whose spiritual ruler, the Patriarch of Antioch, is mentioned in B. The combination Mar Ignatius Elias is not uncommon in recent times as the name of these dignitaries. The first book mentioned by the Metropolitan Ya'qūb appears to have been printed from Syriac type made by him, but on another press. The impression of the letter 's' in A is in several instances very defective, the left-hand loop being open. [Given the similarity of 'm' and 's' in the Sert̄a character, where the loop of the 's' is left open the result is such apparent readings as امداد القسطنطينية, *amadat al-qustantiniyah*, and only close inspection shows that the words where this defective 's' occurs are really spelled correctly.] On the other hand, in B the 's' is perfectly distinct. Dr. Regensburger's copy bears an inscription showing that it was presented to a Rev. G. B. Howard by Mar Joachim, Syrian Metropolitan of India, in the eighteen-sixties, but this connection with India is evidently quite secondary."

Columbia University has in preparation a new edition of the papers of Alexander Hamilton which it is hoped will be the definitive one. It will contain all extant ALEXANDER HAMILTON Hamilton material and the correspondence will include letters to him as well as those that he wrote himself. The Editorial Board would greatly appreciate hearing from anyone knowing of the whereabouts of any such letters or of any other documents that he signed or wrote. All communications should be addressed to Professor Harold C. Syrett, Papers of Alexander Hamilton, Columbia University, New York 27, New York, U.S.A.

The following is a list of recent Library publications, consisting of reprints of articles which appeared in the last issue of the BULLETIN (September 1955) :

"The Turkish Colonization of Anatolia." By W. C. Brice, Lecturer in Geography in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 27. Price three shillings net.

RECENT
LIBRARY
PUBLICA-
TIONS

"The Earliest New Testament." By Kenneth L. Carroll, Assistant Professor in Religion, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. 8vo, pp. 13. Price two shillings net.

"The Making of the Twentieth Century New Testament." By Kenneth W. Clark, Professor of New Testament Language and Literature in Duke University, North Carolina. 8vo, pp. 24. Price three shillings net.

"The Influence of Islamic Culture on Medieval Europe." By Sir Hamilton Gibb, Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford. 8vo, pp. 17. Price two shillings and sixpence net.

"The Lord's Prayer." By T. W. Manson, Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 15. Price two shillings and sixpence net.

"The Autographs of Peter the Deacon." By Paul Meyvaert, O.S.B., Quarr Abbey, Isle of Wight. 8vo, pp. 25, with four plates. Price three shillings net.

"A Contribution to the Archæology of the Western Desert : III (The Temple-Tombs of Alexander the Great and his Palace in Rhacotis: The Great Wall of the Libyan Desert)". By Alan Rowe, Lecturer in Near Eastern Archæology, University of Manchester; sometime Director, Græco-Roman Museum, Alexandria; Representative of Service des Antiquités in Alexandria and the Western Desert, etc. 8vo, pp. 27. Price three shillings net.

"Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple." By Harold H. Rowley, Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 33. Price three shillings and sixpence net.

"Carlyle's Letters." By Charles Richard Sanders, Professor of English at Duke University, North Carolina. 8vo, pp. 26. Price three shillings net.

"A Short Study of Aeneid, Book III." By W. H. Semple, Hulme Professor of Latin in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 16. Price two shillings and sixpence net.

"A Striking Hymn from the Dead Sea Scrolls." By Meir Wallenstein, Lecturer in Medieval and Modern Hebrew, University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 25. Price three shillings and sixpence net.

Since the last issue of the BULLETIN the following donors have made valuable gifts to the Library, and to them the Governors offer grateful thanks :

PRINTED
BOOKS :
GIFTS AND
EXCHANGES

Individual Donors

Norinan Ashworth, Esq.	F. Hourani, Esq. [5].
Shri S. Bhagawadacharyaji [4].	R. Jacoby, Esq.
T. S. Blakeney, Esq. [30].	Mrs. Ellen Jespersen.
The Rev. Dr. John Bowman.	Edgar Johnson, Esq.
Professor Kenneth Brooke.	T. K. Joseph, Esq.
Dr. Curt F. Bühler [7].	J. A. Klausner, Esq.
C. C. Butterworth, Esq.	John Baxter Lee, Esq. [7].
Señor E. Carlos de Hostos [2].	The Rev. S. Levy, M.A.
Dr. W. H. Chaloner [14].	The Librarian [51].
Professor C. R. Cheney, M.A., F.B.A.	Neville B. Mayor, Esq.
The Very Rev. Father Norbert E. Cowin, O.S.B. [2].	The Rev. H. Motley, M.A.
The Right Honourable the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, K.T.	Francis Neilson, Esq. [74].
K. H. Docton, Esq., M.I.Mun.E.	Dr. M. Niemeyer.
The Countess E. L. Doheny.	Dr. Oskar K. Rabinowicz [2].
Miss Dunn.	C. Ramsden, Esq. [3].
Professor Otto Eissfeldt.	Professor J. F. Rock [2].
Dr. J. B. Evenhuis.	Dr. E. I. J. Rosenthal [2].
Professor L. E. Froom [4].	Donald Ross, Esq.
F. R. Goff, Esq.	Dr. Kathleen Rutherford.
Miss Fanny Goldstein [2].	D. C. Rutter, Esq. [2].
D. Graham, Esq.	The Rev. Father A. Schneider.
Ronald Hall, Esq. [2].	Dr. Walter Till [2].
R. Hawkin, Esq.	Dr. J. O. Tjäder.
	D. O. True, Esq.
	Dr. J. Tschichold.
	Dr. A. P. Wadsworth [3].
	Paul Winter, Esq. [2].

Societies and Institutions

- Aberdeen University.
Aberdeen University Library.
Aberystwyth : National Library of Wales.

- Åbo Academy Library [2].
American Catholic Philosophical Association.
Amsterdam : Rijksmuseum [7].
Amsterdam University Library [16].
Auckland Public Library.
Auckland University College Library [3].
Bangalore : Indian Institute of Culture [2].
Basel University Library [17].
Beirut : American University Library.
Berlin : Staatliche Museen : Ägyptische Abteilung [2].
Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia [3].
Birmingham University.
Bogotá University Library [3].
Boston : College of Liberal Arts Library.
Bratislava University Library [5].
Brescia : Ateneo.
Brill, E. J., Publisher, Leiden.
British Academy [2].
Bruxelles : Académie Royale de Belgique : Commission
Royale d'Histoire [20].
Bruxelles : Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie.
Budapest : Magyar Tudományos Akademi.
Budapest : Musée Hongrois des Beaux-Arts [3].
Cairo : Institut d'Égypte.
Cambridge : Fitzwilliam Museum.
Canada : Public Archives.
Canberra : Commonwealth Library [2].
Cape Town : National Gallery [2].
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique [2].
Ceylon : Public Trustee [2].
Chicago : Newberry Library.
Cincinnati : Hebrew Union College.
Colombia, Presidencia de [6].
Colombia : Dirección de Educación Pública [7].
Columbus, Ohio : Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts.
Copenhagen : Kongelige Bibliotek : Institut Danois des
Échanges.
Copenhagen University Library [2].

- Denmark : The Ambassador in London.
Douala : Institut Français d'Afrique Noire.
Edinburgh University.
Egypt : The Consul in Liverpool.
Erlangen University Library [13].
Eyre and Spottiswoode, Limited.
Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte.
Ghent University Library.
Glasgow University Library [5].
Goeje Stichting, Leiden [2].
Gothenburg University Library [3].
Göttingen University Library [2].
Groningen University Library [10].
Grünewald, Mathias, Verlag, Mainz.
Hague : Koninklijke Bibliotheek.
Halle : Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek [2].
Hamburg : Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek [2].
Heidelberg University Library.
Helsinki : Academia Scientiarum Fennica [4].
Helsinki : Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura [2].
Helsinki University Library [18].
Honduras : Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores [4].
Hong Kong University Library [2].
Illinois University Library.
Iraq : Director General of Propaganda.
Kansas University Library [2].
Karlsruhe : Badisches General Landesarchiv [2].
Lancashire Congregational Union.
Leiden University Library [27].
Leningrad : Academy of Sciences [8].
Lexington : Bosworth Memorial College.
Library Association : North Western Branch.
Linz : Oberösterreichischer Musealverein.
Lisbon : Academia Portuguesa de Historia [2].
Lisbon : Institut Français de Portugal [8].
Liverpool Public Libraries [2].
Liverpool University Library.
London : London Library.

- London : School of Oriental and African Studies.
Lords, House of : Clerk of the Records.
Los Angeles : William Andrews Clark Memorial Library [4].
Louisiana State University Library.
Louvain University Library [15].
Lund University Library [3].
Manchester Corporation.
Manchester Statistical Society.
Manchester University [17].
Manchester University Press [4].
Massachusetts Historical Society.
Michigan University Library.
Minnesota University Library.
Montpellier University Library [10].
Monumenta Germaniae Historica.
Munich : Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.
Münster-i.W. University Library [2].
Nancy University Library.
Naples : Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici.
National Register of Archives.
Nelson, Thomas, and Son, Limited.
New York University Library.
New Zealand : The High Commissioner in London.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne : King's College Library.
Northampton, Mass. : Smith College Library.
Obunsha Publishing Company, Limited, Tokyo.
Oregon University Library.
Orthodox Christian Education Society, Chicago.
Oxford : Clarendon Press.
Pavia : Facoltà di Lettere : Biblioteca [5].
Pforzheim : Stadtarchiv [2].
Pilgrim Trust.
Prague University Library [2].
Providence : John Carter Brown Library.
Reading University.
Rome : Pontificium Athenaeum Lateranense.
Saint Andrews University Library [5].
Salamanca University Library [3].

- Sankt Georgen, Frankfurt : Philosophisch-theologische Hochschule.
- San Marino, Cal. : Henry E. Huntington Library.
- Selden Society.
- Sheffield University.
- Shropshire County Council : Record Office.
- Singapore, Colony of : Government [2].
- Société d'Archéologie Copte, Cairo [2].
- Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Stanford University Library [22].
- Stockholm : Högskolas Humanistiska Biblioteket [3].
- Stockholm : Kungliga Biblioteket.
- Stratford-upon-Avon : Shakespeare Memorial Library.
- Swedenborg Society, London.
- Toronto Public Libraries.
- United States of America : National Archives [14].
- U.S.S.R. : Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries [9].
- Utrecht University Library [23].
- Vienna : Nationalbibliothek [2].
- Vienna University Library.
- Warsaw : Polska Akademia Nauk : Komitet Orientalistyczny [3].
- Washington : Library of Congress.
- Williamstown : Chapin Library.
- Yale University Library [2].
- Zürich : Zentralbibliothek [53].

In addition to these donations many learned societies and other bodies have continued to present copies of their periodical publications.

MANEA FEN: AN EXPERIMENT IN AGRARIAN COMMUNITARIANISM, 1838-1841

By W. H. G. ARMYTAGE, M.A.

I

There has been some writing, and much preaching, and the world requires much more of both, to create a powerful influential public opinion in favour of united exertions, and means of enjoyment of health and happiness; but one successful and well conducted agricultural experiment would be more serviceable than either.¹

S O E. T. Craig wrote to *The New Moral World* from Wisbech on 14 August 1838, describing the intended communitarian experiment of William Hodson of Brimstone-Hill, Upwell. Craig spoke from experience to the numerous readers of Robert Owen's *The New Moral World* for he had previously acted as secretary to the communitarian experiment carried out at Ralahine in Ireland.² He described Hodson's estate as follows:

The farm is in the form of a square, at one end of which runs the Bedford River, near which it is intended to erect a number of houses, to form one side of a square, together with an engine for grinding corn &c, a steam apparatus for cooking, heating the dwellings, dormitories &c. I saw about 600 bricks ready for baking which had been made on the spot. . . .

Recommending Hodson as "one of the most practical and scientific farmers in this part of the country" he went on to say that Hodson intended building houses for the reception of the first members, leaving the infant school and other necessary buildings to be erected by the members themselves.

William Hodson followed this up by appealing to readers of *The New Moral World*:

You can never be truly happy whilst you are obliged to touch your hat brinks and call those your superiors who live upon your labours, and take all the advantages they can in keeping you in fear and subjection.

¹ *The New Moral World*, 25 August 1838.

² The Ralahine community flourished between the years 1831-3 and was dispersed because Vandaleur, the owner of the estate, gambled it away in Dublin and his successor in ownership evicted the communionists. See *The Irish Land and Labour Question, illustrated in the history of Ralahine and Co-operative Farming*

and declaring that the united Advancement Societies at Wisbech were behind him. He claimed that his experiment in communitarianism was an answer to contemporary problems :

It is a well known fact that the present distinctions in society are the cause of more envy and strife than anything which has ever been produced in the world. In order to avoid this calamity, there will be no distinction—no individual property, the motto will be "Each for all".

In this community food would be cooked by a special scientific apparatus, there would be a common dining room, a large school-room, and "machinery which has hitherto been for the benefit of the rich, will be adapted in the colony for lessening labour". A steam engine would be erected for thrashing and grinding corn as well as for many other purposes. Land would be let at a moderate rent, and before anyone could be dispossessed, a common vote (in which women would participate) would be taken. The houses for the communitarians were to be erected as quickly as possible :

no time will be lost in erecting fifty houses . . . so that fifty families may form a community. These houses will be constructed with flues so as to heat them to any required temperature, thus avoiding the labour of making fifty fires, to consume an immense fuel besides dirtying the room you live in and also removing the possibility of your children being burnt to death.

Both *The New Moral World* and E. T. Craig cautioned readers not to expect too much, the former quoting the Town Clerk of Ephesus ("Let us do nothing rashly")¹ and the latter prophesying "failure and disappointment" if a community was formed with "the raw materials and men which Mr. Hodson has at command at present".² But their cautionary words were

(Manchester, 1882); E. T. Craig, *An Irish Commune. The history of Ralahine* (Dublin, 1920); William Pare, *Co-operative Agriculture: A solution of the Land Question as exemplified in the history of the Ralahine Co-operative Agricultural Association, County Clare, Ireland* (London, 1870); G. J. Holyoake, *A History of Co-operation*, i. (London, 1906), 178-81; G. D. H. Cole, *A Century of Co-operation* (Manchester, 1944), pp. 22-3, 34, 341. ¹ 25 August 1838.

² *The New Moral World*, 15 September 1838. It is interesting that the National Community Friendly Society, formed by the orthodox Owenites in 1837, looked for an estate in Norfolk and actually contracted to buy the Wretton estate, near Wisbech, of James Hill, who, however, demanded the right to carry it out (Holyoake, op. cit. p. 188). For Hill's interest in social reform (his second wife was the daughter of Dr. Southwood Smith) see C. E. Maurice, *Life of Octavia Hill* (London, 1913), pp. 5-6.

counterbalanced by a surge of enthusiasm that swelled up in the Owenite branches. Thus Branch 16 in London held a public meeting "to consider the best means of promoting the success of this important experiment".¹ This enthusiasm was further whetted by the Secretary of the Cambridgeshire Community, S. Rowbotham, who in the course of a public address said :

Many of you, no doubt, have concluded from the accounts which have some time since appeared in the *Star in the East* and *The New Moral World*, that the situation is unfit for the purpose and the attempt must end in failure. Such were my opinions. But I can now assure you, from personal inspection and residence upon the spot for nearly a fortnight, that the place is in every respect well calculated for a community, and that with the preparations already made, the devotedness and practical knowledge of Mr. Hodson and your concurrence and assistance, we will succeed.²

As Rowbotham outlined it, the scheme seemed simple. Hodson's estate, which was $1\frac{1}{4}$ miles long and $\frac{1}{4}$ mile wide, would maintain fifty or sixty people until the community was established, and it would, through trustees, be able to own the estate in twenty years. The community building, Rowbotham went on, would be finished in a week and the wheat, pigs, and cows offered adequate guarantees of the necessities of life. Moreover, the Bedford River, which ran close by the estate, "would form a beautiful promenade in the summer evening". The prospect of acquiring another 500 acres in a few years would spur the colonists on to make the community a perfect square. The whole project, Rowbotham concluded, "would teach a lesson to our radical friends".

Shining as these portents might seem, the orthodox Owenites were anxious to point out the differences between Hodson's projected community and one of which they would approve. Thus G. A. Fleming, secretary of the National Community Friendly Society, said in *The New Moral World* on 12 January 1839 : "It is all under the entire controul (*sic*) of Mr. Hodson and has no further connection with the body of the Socialists than they individually may think it proper to form." Owen, too, gave his opinion that the minimum strength on which a

¹ Op. cit. 22 September 1838.

² Op. cit. 12 January 1839. *The Star of the East*, published at Wisbech, was edited by James Hill.

community could be based was 500, but at the same time expressed his "cordial sympathy" for the project. "It may become a useful auxiliary to more important and conclusive experiments upon a new principle of society", concluded *The New Moral World*.

Such doubts as were raised were dissipated, however, by the most favourable report of A. Hutchinson, who had been delegated by the Salford Owenites to inquire into the condition of the Hodsonian experiment. Hutchinson spent three days there and confessed that though he had expected to see "a vast extent of black, moorish looking waste where the eye would be spent as if looking on the ocean", he was agreeably mistaken. Instead he saw lots of fertile land, forty acres of wheat, peat for burning and larks, snipe and wild duck in abundance. He confessed himself convinced by the "clear, concise and business-like nature of Mr. Hodson's arrangements".

The Salford group, hearing Hutchinson's favourable report, resolved "to the utmost of their power, to give encouragement by purchasing the various articles they (the colonists) might manufacture or produce", and requested the land committee of the National Community Friendly Society (of which Fleming was the secretary) "to take into their serious consideration the eligibility of the 700 acres adjoining Mr. Hodson's land, for forming a community". Both these resolutions were laid before the central board of the Owenites.

Rowbotham, as secretary of the Hodsonian experiment, was present at this meeting in Salford, as he had also been at another at Birmingham and as he was also to be at Rochdale in which place he delivered a lecture on 21 January 1839. Rochdale, needless to say, followed Salford in passing similar resolutions.

The harmony, so laboriously established between the Hodsonians and the Owenites, did not last long. A stormy meeting took place at the Salford Institution on 16 April 1839, at which they disclaimed all connection with Mr. Hodson and his proceedings. The cause was not far to seek. Charles Crawford, of Garnet Street, Stockport had been one of those who had gone to Manea Fen in the Christmas of 1838 and had returned, beggared, on 1 April 1839. "I am without home and without

bread", he complained, "as the tools by which I earned my bread have not reached their destination."¹ He claimed that in his three months in the community he had received no wages.

But others of the colonists did not agree. Thus E. Wastney came out strongly with a condemnation of the first colonists who were not prepared to make the best of things.

They commenced finding fault with one another and with everything about them. At the time of our arrival the first general split had taken place, there had been a fall spent on nothing but useless discussions; previous to this split there were no less than 7 females and 4 males constantly engaged to manage the household department which at that time consisted of about 30 persons. . . . All they (the first colonists) did was look to the provisions, this I assure you was done in the most disgusting manner possible . . . they paid much more attention to the beer shops and the company of the lowest prostitutes that were to be found in the district.

Wastney painted a Hogarthian picture of the drunken riots—lasting the whole night—and concluded, "a worse selection of persons for carrying out any great object of this description than the parties who have left this establishment it would be impossible to make".²

II

In view of the jaundiced view of their condition presented by the orthodox Owenite journals, the Manea Fen communitarians decided to establish one of their own "to defend the Community, report its proceedings, and form a medium of communications between the society and the people". This was *The Working Bee*, a weekly "intended to be devoted to the best interests of the Industrious Classes". As the announcement ran:

The Working Bee will be commenced by a Society of Working Men, associated to carry into Effect Practical Communities of Equality of Duties, Rights, and Means of Enjoyment, the Establishment of which will give Universal Suffrage, and the whole Produce of their Labour, to all who are now robbed of their Political and Social Privileges.

"He who will not work neither shall he eat" ran the sub-title, and the publishers (the Trustees of the Hodsonian Community Society) delegated the editorship and printing to John Green, a

¹ *The New Moral World*, 4 May 1839; see also Crawford's letter in the same paper on 8 June 1839.

² *The Working Bee*, 3 August 1839.

former Owenite lecturer in Liverpool,¹ who brought out the first number on 20 July 1839.

This marked, in more senses than one, a new phase in the history of the community. For it marked the dropping of Samuel Rowbotham, who, *The Working Bee* announced, "is neither secretary to, nor a member of, this society". This was obviously because of the riff-raff he had netted on his evangelistic tour of the north of England. It also marked the emergence of the community as a revolutionary cell, since the editorial renounced "the old world" as "false, hollow and rotten . . . in error alike in its religion, its morals, economies and politics". The dawn of a new world was proclaimed, and the community lined itself up behind the tradition of Confucius, Plato, More, Bacon, Harrington, Bellers, Godwin, and Holcroft as a witness to the eternal truth that "man's feelings and convictions are formed for him, his actions flow from the operation of external circumstances". Above all, they claimed to be "Communionists" (the word was their own) :

All amongst us is ours. No mine or their is here in our community but universal commonality of interest is felt and expressed throughout our establishment. . . . Amongst us are no drunkards, no swearers, no prostitutes, no tradesmen and no thieves. We have no such places as St. Giles, London; Angel Street, Manchester; or Lace Street, Liverpool; contrasting their filth and ignorance, with the princely mansions, and sons and daughters of fashionable life.

So assured were the trustees of the community that they announced their intention to refuse admittance to anyone unless they had first served as hired individuals. Referring to their "file of applications" they declared themselves aware of the "heart cries" of those who were prejudicing their jobs in "the old world" by propagating the truths of communitarianism. The conveyance of the estate to the trustees was announced on 27 July by Hodson himself, in an article which did much to alleviate the suspicions aroused by the adverse experiences of

¹ He was the author of *The Emigrants* (Manchester, 1838) and *Casper Hauser or the Power of External Circumstances exhibited in forming Human Character* (Manchester, 1840). Holyoake, who does not mention his interest in Manea Fen, recalled (op. cit. i. 237) that "he was a useful lecturer. . . . He afterwards went to America, where, before he had acquired the faculty of seeing two ways at once, necessary in that land, he was cut into halves by a railway train. He held some official position on the line."

Charles Crawford of Stockport. He declared that it was a year since he had first become an Owenite, and that it was only after he had "travelled over the greater part of England" looking for a suitable site that he decided to offer his own estate of 200 acres "to facilitate an incipient practical community". It was the opposition he met, Hodson went on, which forced him to "believe such as would come":

Most of them penniless in pocket and bankrupt of moral qualifications; incurring me great sums in their expenses and causing much unpleasant feelings by the vulgarity of their manners and immorality of proceedings. To carry out our object with such discordants would have been the acme of absurdity. I therefore saw it advisable that these parties should return to their former state of society, until arrangements are made by which we can more effectually operate upon them. That such parties should, when they returned to their old associations, make out the best tale they could is not to be wondered at, nor need you be surprised that their relations, absurd as they are, should be listened to with the greatest avidity by our opponents.¹

He confessed he had suffered "much pecuniary loss by sending the parties alluded to to their homes".

Since Hodson had staked his entire fortune on the experiment, it is at this point worth considering what sort of man he was. He was thirty-one years old, and had spent six years afloat. "Six years of maritime life combined with vivacity of temperament, preclude the sobriety of the saint or the formality of an anchorite", he warned the colonists "and if at any time, Gentlemen, you observe too great a levity in my proceedings, I shall esteem it a favour to be corrected by you". He had also been a Methodist lay-preacher, but ran into trouble with that sect because he married his deceased wife's sister—a heinous crime as the law then stood.²

The trustees at first numbered four—the John Green whom we have already met as editor of *The Working Bee*; Edmund Wastney, whom we have met defending the community against the attacks of Charles Crawford; Thomas Doughty and William Cutting. They evidently worked with a will throughout the early summer months for, with Doughty as architect, four houses

¹ *The Working Bee*, 27 July 1839.

² Ibid. and 15th February 1840. He very probably heard Owen speak on 11, 12, and 13 July 1838, when Owen was staying with James Hill of Wisbech (Holyoake, op. cit. i. 63).

were started, twelve others were rising, and a railway, some 200-300 yards long, connected them to the brick kilns. Other buildings finished were the kitchen (with larder, wash-house and oven), the dormitory (for hired labourers) a library, a dormitory, a dining room for fifty people and a dormitory for six married people. There was a compositors room (9 ft. × 9 ft.) for the press, a barn for the joiners and a six-roomed cottage. The clay pit (40 ft. × 12 ft.), now some 22 feet deep, had yielded clay for 100,000 bricks, for which the kiln had been built, and was drained by an "Archimedean screw". But perhaps the most singular feature of all was an observatory on the top of which floated a tricolour with the Union Jack—indicative of conquered tyranny—"cowering below it". This had two platforms—one housing forty people for tea, and the other sixteen.

They announced their intention of building a further set of some seventy-two cottages to form a square, the fourth side of which was to be open to the banks of the River Bedford. This was to be the first of a series of from six to eight squares "as circumstances may determine, in which we shall be enabled to classify our members according to time of membership, congeniality of mind, knowledge of our principles, and amiability . . . preparatory to the erection of a final community". Less remote was the intention to build a windmill of eight horse power to drain the clay-pit, without which such plans would never mature.¹

The achievement of the trustees was tangible. Thirty-five acres of wheat, twenty-seven of oats, twenty-four of grass, a hundred of fallow, with fifty acres ploughed in the preceding week was no small achievement. And, as a sign that things of the mind had not been forgotten, a schoolmaster from Hill's² infant school at Wisbech, one Craig, had been established in the library with his class. Nor were the lighter sides of life forgotten: a gymnasium was in use and a cricket ground had been laid.³ But perhaps the most surprising venture under active

¹ *The Working Bee*, 3 August 1839.

² For Hill see above, p. 289 n. 2.

³ *The Working Bee*, 10 August 1839.

consideration was a laboratory. Well might one correspondent tell a friend in far-away Penzance, "My dear fellow, in seven years from this, Manea Fen will present the appearance of Paradise".¹

To the conservative Fen farmers, however, Manea Fen was the very reverse. *The Cambridge Advertiser* carried a letter in early August from one of them trusting that it "may have the effect of inducing pious and well-disposed persons to take IMMEDIATE steps to counteract the sting of *The Working Bee*. If this is not done, I fear we shall, before long, find that the fearful scenes of 1816 will be again enacted in this place and neighbourhood; for when once the religious principles of the people are undermined, what security is there for life or property. . . . It is clear the editor and his correspondents ridicule the idea of future rewards and punishments, and entertain very lax notions of morals and the intercourse of the sexes."² Another local, but more vocal, critic was the Christian Advocate to the University of Cambridge, the Rev. G. Pearson, who expressed his horror both at the ruling doctrine at Manea Fen—that man was not responsible for his actions—and at the concubinage which he professed to find there :

It is impossible to say how much mischief such a body of men may not be capable of doing amongst the more ignorant and depraved part of the native population, by personal exertions, secretly and cautiously employed, and by the distribution of cheap publications of an infidel and revolutionary character.

He went on :

I am informed, on good authority, that the colony at Manea Fen is very assiduous both in preaching and in dispensing small tracts, in the propagation of their infidel and revolutionary doctrines, and that, after the harvest, they purpose to undertake a lecturing tour, for the purpose of making their opinions more extensively known.

Calling on the clergy to be on their guard, he continued :

As the existence of these infidels in this country may not be generally known, much less their contemplated scheme of making proselytes amongst the rural population, I trust that the clergy and religious persons of every description, will excuse the liberty which I have taken of drawing their attention to the subject . . . and be on their guard against the extension of these emissaries of infidelity among the country parishes, and may take measures to avert these flagitious and wicked attempts.³

¹ *The Working Bee*, 10 August 1839.

² *Ibid.* 14 August 1839.

³ *Ibid.* 28 September 1839.

If nothing else, these two attacks showed that the communionists were, by now, sufficient of a challenge to the established order in Cambridge to merit attention. And that challenge looked like being strengthened by the election of a Board of Directors at Manea on 4 November 1839. Hodson himself was elected President (for five years) and agricultural director and was given six colleagues : Green (of the press), Joseph Davidge (of stores), William Cutting (of the smiths), Thomas Doughty (of the bricklayers), whilst Edmund Wastney was appointed secretary (*pro. tem.*).¹

III

But the internal, personal conflicts were visible too, for on 12 November the Directors met to hear a complaint by Doughty that he had received "brutal and disgraceful treatment" from Green. The conflict was evidently one between the two most intelligent members of the community, for Doughty was the architectural director and Green had been the very efficient editor of *The Working Bee*.

A public meeting was called in the evening of the same day and Green offered to leave in twenty-four hours. He was given £2 to go away. In three days W. H. Bellatti was chosen to succeed Green as editor and S. Collinson to act as Director of the Printing Establishment. Green had evidently annoyed both Hodson and Doughty, for the announcement of his departure read, "Through the professions of Mr. Green the Director was induced, before the society was legally formed, to buy printing machinery" and described him as "issuing from his office, using the most violent language towards an unoffending fellow-creature, accompanied by threats, which, in the old state of society, would have subjected him to the laws of his country".² Green's departure was unfortunate, and he regretted it, since he left his wife and child behind. He voiced it in a poem *I left in Grief*, one verse of which ran :

Adieu dear Fen, in thee are hearts,
From which I ne'er would wish to sever.
Whose love, too deep to be effaced,
Is stamped *within my heart for ever*.³

¹ *The Working Bee*, 16 November 1839.

² *Ibid.* 23 November 1839.

³ *Ibid.* 7 December 1839.

As secretary, Wastney set about recruiting other personnel. An advertisement appeared above his signature in *The Working Bee* of 23 November 1839, asking for candidates specifying that "they must be first-rate workmen, and well acquainted with the principles of socialism, and of the following trades, viz. one Wheelwright, one Cabinet Maker, one Printer, two Joiners and one Gardener." They got a number of replies¹ and were able to select accordingly.

Another new departure was the inauguration of a scientific column in *The Working Bee*, probably due to the new Director of the Printing Establishment, Samuel Collinson, of Rochdale. He had joined the community five months earlier, in June, having left Rochdale the previous March. He was also probably responsible for the recruitment of two more Rochdale men by the community: Cropper and Heywood. Certainly the defections from that quarter seemed to annoy Fleming who attempted to dissuade them from going.²

Indeed, the Owenites were now quite anxious to check the progress of Manea Fen, since they were busy establishing their own community at Tytherly. One of the most vocal and powerful of Owen's supporters was Isaac Ironside, who had been mainly responsible for building the first Hall of Science in the country at Sheffield.³ Ironside now came down in person to visit Manea Fen, and when he left he took the community's builder with him. The community was furious:

This gentleman (i.e. Ironside), decoyed our builder . . . he sent a letter to the director of the brick-making establishment informing him that he is chosen to go to Tytherly and must leave us forthwith and repair to Sheffield to receive instructions prior to going there . . . were we actuated by the method pursued by inhabitants of the old world, of dealing with offenders according to their deserts, we should give Mr. Ironside a very different reception if he ever honoured us with any more of his "social visits". It is the conduct of such men as Mr. Ironside that does so much injury to the great cause in which we ought to be engaged rather in assisting than injuring each other.⁴

Little injury, however, seems to have been done to the community for the close of the year saw a most encouraging progress

¹ *The Working Bee*, 3 November, 1839.

² *Ibid.* 7 November 1839.

³ Isaac Ironside, 1808-70, was Owen's most active supporter in Sheffield and became one of the promoters of the Tytherly establishment.

⁴ *The Working Bee*, 30 November 1839.

report. The windmill was finished on the very day in which the communionists received the Enrolled rules from the revising barrister, so in honour of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, it was ceremonially named Tidd Pratt.¹ This gave the community a source of power: water could be now pumped out of the clay-pit; a circular saw of 36-inch diameter could be worked; a lathe and grindstone could be turned: and, perhaps the greatest refinement of all, circular brushes for cleaning boots and shoes, or knives and forks, could be operated.² As the news of the Tytherly community came in through the columns of *The New Moral World*, the Manea Fen community could proudly boast:

our houses are now rapidly approaching completion and we hope in a short time to see every member and candidate comfortably lodged. Our school will be finished in a few days and we have formed ordinances for its government.³

A thousand fruit trees were purchased, and the members agreed to work from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Financially, the situation was equally encouraging. The communionists had already repaid William Hodson £600 of the money he had loaned them and at that rate they looked like owning their 200 acres of land free of debt in three years. Hodson himself acknowledged that "The community has now ceased to be dependent on me". It was governed by regulations which could not be altered except "by the consent of the members". "I would impress upon all parties", he told them, "that I can have but little influence over the society I have had the pleasure of forming." With Wastney as secretary and the stalwarts Cutting, Davidge, Doughty, G. Dunn, and D. Jones as trustees, it looked as if it was prospering exceedingly. The time was obviously propitious for the community to fan out and establish branches, and this they proceeded to do.

¹ Tidd Pratt, 1797-1870, who was counsel to certify the rules of savings banks and friendly societies from 1834-46. His vigilance on behalf of the public was known and he would disclose, as far as official restraints allowed, the unsound condition of any benefit or friendly society which he found.

² Probably a shaft, attached to the steam engine, drove them.

³ *The Working Bee*, 14 December 1839.

IV

The expansionist policy of the community was undertaken on the most practical lines. "We are anxious to extend the benefits we have received", wrote the editor of *The Working Bee*, "to all who feel desirous of co-operating with us in the noble and benevolent cause in which we have engaged." Branches were to be "chartered" in each town where there were more than ten sympathisers. These branches were "to disseminate as extensively as possible the principles of co-operation, by circulating *The Working Bee* and such publications as may, from time to time, emanate from this society, and to establish *Depots* for the sale of such articles as may be manufactured for sale by members of this Establishment. From these Branches, we shall, in future, select individuals as members to fill up vacancies, extend our operation, and augment our numbers."¹

Hodson followed up this manifesto by a lecture tour of the Midland Counties. On Boxing Day, 1839, he spoke at Leicester, with some effect, at the festival of their Institution, securing six recruits who joined Manea Fen in the following February.² On 27 December he spoke at Nottingham "in a chapel", and reported :

I saw here an invention for weaving stockings by power made by a Mr. Barton,³ formerly of A.1 Branch, London. This gentleman must not be long out of community, he must either be with us or at Tytherly. The Rational Religionists would do well to secure his services.⁴

From Nottingham he travelled to Lincoln, where he spoke at the Guildhall on 28 December to an audience which included "Lawyers, Clergymen and Physicians" who "appeared paralysed with the novel views" they heard. Here he was sharply questioned by a local Methodist minister, the Rev. Mr. Roebuck who, said Hodson, "wished to draw me out upon

¹ *The Working Bee*, 28 December 1839.

² These consisted of Slingsby (a joiner) and his wife and child; Baker (a wheelwright) and his wife; and Green (a bricklayer and plasterer). These brought the strength of the community up to forty-two.

³ For whom see W. H. G. Armytage, *A. J. Mundella, 1825-1897: The Liberal Background of the Labour Movement* (London, 1951), p. 22.

⁴ *The Working Bee*, 4 January 1840.

Religion, but could not, for my object was to teach the people how to live happily, his to teach them how to die. My replies to him on the Marriage question seemed to give satisfaction." Here Hodson "engaged a gentleman who for many years was connected with a provincial paper" as well as Charles Bates, an ironmonger.¹

This missionary journey certainly attracted attention. Perhaps one of its more interesting by-products was to stimulate the formation of yet another community—this time at Pant-Glas in Merionethshire, by John Moncas and a Liverpool body who described themselves as "The Community of United Friends". It also experienced the discouraging comment of *The New Moral World*. But Moncas showed where his real inspiration lay by sending reports of his communitarian experiment to *The Working Bee*, and looking to Manea Fen as his model.² Even more interesting was its aggravation of John Brindley,³ formerly a master at the National School of March, Cambridgeshire, who emerged at this time as a formidable peripatetic anti-socialist lecturer and seems to have taken a particular dislike to the Manea Fen community. The Bishop of Exeter, the notable Dr. Phillpotts,⁴ was also most vocal in the House of Lords at this time.

On Hodson's return the Directors began to envisage a community of 700 people.⁵ Certainly the number of people who came to look round the colony became so large that they had regretfully to announce that they could no longer serve refreshments without payment. Among these visitors was G. A. Fleming himself, who visited them on behalf of the orthodox Owenites. The secretary of the community was by now W. P. Throsby. D. Jones had retired from the directorate and had

¹ His speech was well reported in the *Lincoln Gazette*, 30 December 1839, but the *Lincolnshire Chronicle* of the same date described it as a "blasphemous effusion" and Hodson as "a minion of mischief".

² It was reported in *The Working Bee* of 3 February 1840 and other accounts appeared 24 April, 8, 15 August, and 9 September.

³ John Brindley's past activities were constantly exposed in *The Working Bee*.

⁴ G. C. B. Davies, *Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, 1778-1869* (London, 1954).

⁵ *The Working Bee*, 29 February 1840. On 28 March that year they actually numbered fifty-two.

been replaced by Slingsby, a joiner, one of the recruits obtained at Leicester during Hodson's missionary tour. *The Working Bee* was to be transformed into "an effective organ for the dissemination of social principles and a source of profit to the community". From this time onwards they began to share copy with the *New Moral World*.

The goodwill of the Universal Community Society of Rational Religionists, as the main body of the Owenites, now seemed fairly assured. For, in an article entitled "A look around us" in *The New Moral World*, the author wrote of the Manea Fen colonists :

Their establishment has been in existence upwards of 12 months ; it has, however, made comparatively speaking, but a small progress owing to the unfavourable circumstances under which it was commenced, and which, during a considerable portion of the first year, continued to attend its management. None regretted these drawbacks more than we did nor would have more gladly assisted in their removal ; but a misapprehension at the commencement prevented both parties from understanding each other ; and we were, therefore, content to leave its rectification to Dr. Time, who, as a correspondent wittily remarks, "is a physician who gives most successful prescriptions in cases of disagreement". The obstructions to the progress and good management of Manea Fen have, we understand, now been removed, and the greater portion of these difficulties incident to all new undertakings surmounted.

He quoted from *The Working Bee* of 29 February 1840 :

As the conveniences of our community are of such a nature as to increase our members considerably, we shall feel a pleasure to correspond with anyone who can shew to the Directors that their trade or occupation would be an advantage to the community. The past year has been devoted to the building of suitable dwellings and other conveniences : this being done, it will be our wish to make advantageous additions to our numbers, as we have had an offer of 260 acres more rich land, from Mr. Hodson. We calculate that this, in addition to what we have, will support 700 individuals, and it will be our aim to admit this number as speedily as possible. . . . We possess the fullest confidence in the integrity and high moral qualities of the excellent Secretary to whose management we are inclined to attribute much of the latter prosperity of the Community. . . . A wide stretch of country lies between Tytherly and Manea : it must be the object of both colonies to unite them by a chain of happy community ; and however much we may now smile at the idea of doing so, let us recollect, that not many years since, several miles intervened between some of the Shaker establishments in America, which are now separated by two or three fields. A close cordial union among the friends of socialism, and mutual assistance, will effect wonders.¹

¹ *The New Moral World*, 14 March 1840.

Fleming described his own visit in a later number of *The New Moral World*.

The building and agricultural operations are proceeding with great vigour and determination ; the winter sown crops are looking well, though there is as yet that unfinished appearance about the place which may be expected from large works in the process of execution ; it is evident that the colonists possess a command over very substantial advantages and their steady well-directed efforts will speedily effect all that can be desired. Another harvest will place the success of the establishment beyond doubt, and afford an example to capitalists which we earnestly hope many of them will follow.¹

The healing of the breach with Fleming and the Owenites was symbolized by the appearance of Hodson at the Co-operative Congress in May 1840, where he appealed for a committee of enquiry into his community. Explaining that the average population of Manea Fen over the past year had not been below twenty, that they had built twenty-four houses and some workshops, he urged that the Rational Society should join forces with Manea Fen : Tytherly becoming an educational, and Manea Fen an agricultural community. His proposition was discussed but the old guard of the Rational Society refused to co-operate. Yet Hodson was not downcast. On the contrary, on Whit Tuesday he was to be found at Highbury Barn at a grand tea and ball in honour of Owen.

A completely new *The Working Bee* was issued on 6 June 1840 with the motto "United to support ; but not combined to injure". It contained information of the Board's plan to erect a "Machine Establishment" at Manea Fen for the manufacture of thrashers and drills. They informed their supporters that they had been offered a cast iron moulder, blow furnace, a steam engine and "every other requisite for carrying on a foundry". To enable this to be operated they appealed for the help of first-rate mechanics and when these were forthcoming, they would commence the building required. They also appealed for two bricklayers and individuals from the Staffordshire potteries who could make chimney pots, flower pots, and other refractory products. In the same issue they begged to inform the public that building bricks, flooring tiles, drain pipes and pantiles

¹ *The New Moral World*, 28 March 1840.

could be furnished to customers, and delivered by the boats of the community. Also, singularly enough, they offered "good worsted and other stockings".¹

These boats were multi-service craft, for earlier, on 9 May, colonists had been reported as sailing up the Bedford River to Walney, "enlivening the way with stirring songs", in a six-oared cutter. This they repeated in June, attending a Ranters Meeting where they quite stole the show. For as *The Working Bee* proudly confessed everyone turned to look at "the colonists". "A great improvement is manifested in the manners of the people towards us", it continued, "we receive no insult from them now, or nothing worth calling such."² Their sailing boat was aptly named *The Morning Star*.

The growth of the community was reflected in three important ways: money and dress and leisure. Money was abandoned in the community—labour notes being issued for work done and cashed at the store. "This plan saves us the trouble of getting cash . . . money is merely the representation of wealth", Hodson told the Co-operative Congress.³ Dress also became distinctive, and at a special meeting of the Community on 2 June it was decided to adopt a uniform: tunic, trousers, and straw hats (with caps in the winter time) for the men; dresses for females.⁴ The leisured activities of the community were severely practical. Chemistry classes had been established in the previous winter, and these continued, varied by excursions up the river.⁵

Visitors continued to be attracted in such numbers that a "conductor" was appointed. One of the curious was the former Agricultural superintendent of the Tytherly community—Heaton Aldam, who the month before had resigned his post there. It was, perhaps, the euphoria generated by such continued expatiation on the merits of Manea Fen that led the Directors, in announcing their intention to build three lime

¹ They also announced the accession of Hodges (a knitter), his wife and four children and Ward (also a knitter), together with his wife and two children: all from Leicester.

² *The Working Bee*, 13 June 1840.

⁴ *Ibid.* 13 June 1840.

³ *Ibid.* 30 May 1840.

⁵ *Ibid.* 4 April 1840.

kilns, to say "These additions to our premises will soon give us all the appearance of a town". Certainly they seemed to be forging ahead : a school was flourishing, and on 27 June they were able to announce "the first birth in the community"—a daughter to William Hodson.¹ And to the visitors must be added the invitations sent by Bradford, Northampton, Wigan, and Hinckley to William Hodson, offering lecture rooms so that he could explain the community to sympathizers. Hodson announced that as soon as a sufficient number were obtained he would "lay down an itinerary".² Probably one reason for this interest was Hodson's insistence on the fact that dissatisfied socialists had no need to emigrate to the backwoods utopias of the United States of America, or settlements in the colonies.³ As he said, 26,388,907 of the 60,038,907 acres of cultivable land in England was being cultivated, and of this residue over 5,000,000 acres was capable of bearing grain. He went on :

The schemes of that class of men who think it better to go abroad than to produce at home, have often struck us as absurd. . . . These incorporations (i.e. communitarian settlements) would be far more likely to prove successful than attempts to colonise Van Diemen's Land or New Zealand.⁴

V

Unusually fine weather marked the August of 1840. This enabled the communionists to gather their harvest of wheat, mustard and oats. The last two alone were estimated to bring in £900.⁵ To this task all hands were turned, for, as *The Working Bee* said : "in the ideal communities of Sir T. More, and in the existing communities in America, the plan is said to be adopted at harvest time of all hands leaving their customary occupations to gather the corn." Even the "gymnastic apparatus" was put aside.

The desire for union with Tytherly showed itself. "Union, Union" cried *The Working Bee* of 5 September. Three weeks later, lamenting that Tytherly was to be abandoned (for the

¹ A death had already occurred, also in Hodson's family (of his daughter) on 15 January 1840.

² *The Working Bee*, 11 July 1840.

³ For the most comprehensive account of these see A. E. Bestor, *Backwoods Utopias*. (Pennsylvania, 1950)

⁴ *The Working Bee*, 11 July 1840.

⁵ *Ibid.* 29 August 1840.

dissensions there had become so acute that C. F. Green had been instructed to reduce the membership), *The Working Bee* was plaintively asking its readers to "take goods manufactured by the hands of co-operators. If, my friends, you will do this, without any other subscription, we soon shall be able to offer a model community to you."

Certainly Manea Fen seemed healthier than Tytherly, where numbers had now sunk to nineteen—of which seven were children of ten years of age and under. To this some fifteen or so hired labourers should be added, making the total thirty-five. Manea Fen, on the other hand, had fifty "in community"—and showed how they were deployed : fifteen in thrashing oats for market, eighteen in claying the land, six on *The Working Bee*, three gardeners, a schoolmaster, brickmakers and the remainder employed in various tasks. All that was needed was a market for their products.¹ As Hodson argued :

What can be made or effected in community, let it be purchased by Socialists. The profits accruing therefrom would enable us to start some other branch of manufacture, more than we have now. If every Socialist wore the stockings made in community, very soon would we be enabled to send cotton and linen goods to wear, and thus bring into community many of that injured race existing in the manufacturing districts.

And, referring to his approaching tour—the prelude to a society independent of the Owenites with auxiliary branches of its own, he wrote :

I shall in my tour form societies, the members of which will stand pledged, so long as they continue members, to purchase all articles of our manufacture, without injury to their interest. Depots will be formed, conducted by trustworthy and creditable parties, with a Grand Central Depot in London—to and from which all transactions will proceed.

This courageous, forward-looking policy seemed to attract those who had found the dissensions in the two other communities unbearable. From Tytherly returned two craftsmen who had previously belonged to the Manea Fen community : Storey, a brickmaker, and Collinson, a printer ; while from the Pant Glas community (now broken up) came Robert Reed, and another, Horner, a printer, applied to return. *The Working Bee*, with a hint of sanctimony, announced : "sincerely do we

¹ F. Podmore, op. cit. p. 537 ; *The Working Bee*, 26 September 1840.

hope we shall be enabled to provide an asylum to those who have been debarred from continuing their exertions elsewhere."¹

There seemed to be an open challenge to Robert Owen and the old Guard of the Rational Religionists being formulated. B. Warden attacked "the social priesthood" of Owen's "missionaries" and suggested that they would be more useful in a community than on a lecture platform.² Yet at the same time Hodson was negotiating with the Owenite Central Board for a union on the basis of self-governing communities. He was probably induced to do this because Owen, William Galpin, and F. Bate (who had engraved a picture of the Manea Fen community) had formed "The Home Colonisation Society" to provide funds for Tytherly without straining the finances of the Central Board. Hodson's idea was that the Central Board should raise money to lend, and that all future communities should emanate from those already in existence. His proposal was defeated by sixteen votes to four.³

VI

The rejection of Hodson's overtures threw the Manea Fen colony back to its own resources—and the coming winter. How were they to sell the products of their labour? *The Working Bee* suggested that if every one of its 5,000 readers bought a pair of stockings it would keep three stocking makers active for a year.⁴ But this alone would not repay the outlay—some £6,000—on the blacksmiths shop, the printing office, the file shed, the brick kiln, the windmill, the twenty-four houses, the dining rooms, the kitchen, the sleeping apartments and the outhouses.

So the members of the community held a meeting in order to solve the problem. Hodson agreed to give up the presidency (he preferred to do so) in order to travel for the community and "live to carry forward the good cause of communities". From what he said, it was largely due to his wife that he took this decision, for, he confessed, "Mrs. Hodson is not a Socialist".⁵

¹ *The Working Bee*, 26 September 1840.

² *Ibid.* 3 October 1840. ³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* 10 October 1840.

⁵ *Ibid.* 31 October 1840.

He was described by a reporter for the *Liverpool Albion* who visited the community at this time as :

a man well fitted for the enterprise he has undertaken : in the prime of life, with an athletic frame which fits him for the physical difficulties of his situation. He possesses a mind of great energy and high intellectual capabilities.

The *Liverpool Albion* reporter was impressed by the community too ; its teetotalism and sobriety, its adherence to majority rule, and its business-like nature. For the members, he went on, hold the estate on a twenty-one year lease, paying 5 per cent. interest on the purchase money as rent. Hodson was described as having advanced £2,000 for which he held notes-of-hand, and as having spent £3,000 on the buildings. "There is no lack of exertion", commented the writer, indicating the fifty-five acres of oats, the eight stacks of wheat, and the seventeen acres of mustard, and continued, "Amidst all their worldly-wise proceedings it would seem they have a dash of romance about them . . . all proceed to the fields with music at their head." He was much impressed with their two boats, their project for a railway, the chemical enthusiasm of Hodson himself—made manifest in the evening classes, and especially the uniform dress :

The men wear a green habit . . . presenting an appearance somewhat like the representation of Robin Hood and his foresters, or of the Swiss mountaineers. The dress of the females is much the same as the usual fashion, with trousers, and the hair worn in ringlets. . . . They are quite the lions of the villages round about.¹

Six years of maritime life had endowed Hodson with a tendency to speak out when things displeased him and he had earlier asked the colonists that, if at any time they observed "too great a levity" in his proceedings, he "would esteem it a favour to be corrected by them."² The significance of these remarks was now borne in upon the colonists as the winter closed in about them. With his non-Socialist wife at his elbow, Hodson's stock of both money and patience, seemed to run out. Distrusted by the editor of the *New Moral World*, his overtures rejected by the Central Board, faced with the prospect of having to finance the community from his own resources, and deprived of the

¹ *The Working Bee*, 28 November 1840.

² *Ibid.* 5 February 1840.

comfortable security of his friend James Hill's bank (which failed in 1840), he seems to have run into personal difficulties and a circular was issued by the trustees of the community concerning his conduct. *The New Moral World* remarked that this " raised so many questions of business and law that we must make ourselves fully acquainted with the facts and bearings of the case, before we can venture to do more than thus allude to the matter ".¹

The grisly end of the whole experiment was soon painfully documented. The members of the community, convinced of Hodson's unfitness of the post, were powerless to force him out because they depended on him for " pecuniary advances ". Three days before Christmas 1840, Hodson gave orders to the meat contractors to stop deliveries to the community. A public meeting of the communitarians decided to take over management, do away with hired labour, dispose of the lighters and to consult a solicitor. Hodson's reply was to seize the books. Another members' meeting was convened on Christmas Day, and the members unanimously condemned his action. There, however, unanimity ended. A pro-Hodson party formed and when, four days later, another members' meeting was convened, to ask for the books, Hodson pointed out that he possessed the money obtained by the sale of the crops, and when they demanded it, he replied that it was in the hands of " a gentleman in March ".

Tension mounted. *The Working Bee* ceased publication. The leader of the anti-Hodsonians, the oldest member of the community, William Davidge, was obviously the main target for Hodson's anger and on 30 February, one of the pro-Hodsonians shot at him with a gun. What is worse, the pro-Hodsonians formed a kind of terrorist group. *The New Moral World* reported " men with bludgeons have constantly been about the premises ; the shops and rooms have been broken into and their contents taken out. Nearly all the members have now resigned. The remainder are determined to obtain possession if they can ".²

¹ *The New Moral World*, 9 January 1841.

² *Ibid.* 20 February 1841.

It was a hopeless task which they soon abandoned. Ten years later, Robert Gardner could write :

From 100 to 200 of the disciples of Robert Owen, commonly called Owenites, located themselves here for about 12 months, within the last few years. They occupied 150 acres of land, had everything in common, according to their system ; and published (whilst here) a paper or pamphlet called *The Working Bee*. But alas ! for the mutability of human institutions, the Socialists have fled.¹

And today, the only memorial of their lively presence at Manea Fen is the name Colony Farm.

¹ Robert Gardner, *History, Gazetteer and Directory of Cambridgeshire* (Peterborough, 1851), p. 497.

THE EVE OF MAGNA CARTA¹

By C. R. CHENEY, M.A., F.B.A.

PROFESSOR OF MEDIEVAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

ALTHOUGH Magna Carta has been a household word in England for more than seven centuries, it is less than two hundred years since the scientific study of the great charter of King John was initiated by one of England's most celebrated lawyers, William Blackstone. Writing in 1759 he said : "There is no transaction in the antient part of our english history more interesting and important, than the rise and progress, the gradual mutation, and final establishment of the charters of liberties . . . and yet there is none that has been transmitted down to us with less accuracy and historical precision. . . . This want of authentic materials, or neglect of recurring to such as might be easily had, . . . has often betrayed our very best historians and most painful antiquarians into gross and palpable errors, as will in some measure appear from the following deduction."² He concludes by leaving the last word on the Charter to "some masterly and comprehensive genius", but opines that such a one may be wanting in "critical attention to dates, and names, and other minuter circumstances".³

Blackstone's care and acuteness cleared away some of the muddle surrounding the Magna Carta of 1215; and from his day to ours the Charter has been continuously studied. It is, however, many years since anyone attempted a chronological account of the weeks which preceded its issue. That is my object : to establish dates. I am not concerned with the constitutional importance of the Charter : I am trying to find the order of preceding political events. Even so, I shall not

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 11th of May 1955, printed with some additions and changes. I am indebted to Professor V. H. Galbraith, Mr. Eric John, and my wife for criticism and advice.

² William Blackstone, *The Great Charter and the Charter of the Forest* (Oxford, 1759), p. i.

³ *Ibid.* p. lxxvi.

attempt to include all relevant events, but only to provide a chronological framework in which they will fit. Our sources are inadequate, and a plausible conjecture is often all that can be offered instead of a certain conclusion. Nevertheless the attempt is worth making. The "critical attention to dates" of which Blackstone spoke should not be beneath the dignity of serious students of history. I invite you, then, to follow me along a somewhat arid track of facts and dates. As we go we may gain incidental light upon the situation, besides preparing the chronological path for some future "masterly and comprehensive genius" to tread.

The period which I wish to study and which I have described as "the eve of Magna Carta" begins in Easter Week 1215 and comprises some nine weeks. A rather protracted *eve*, you may think: but Mr. H. G. Richardson, in an important contribution to the BULLETIN in 1944, made the "morrow of the Great Charter" last a full three months.

I

Now, in January 1215, Low Sunday, that is the Sunday next after Easter, 26 April, had been appointed as the day when King John would answer a request for redress of grievances which an important group of barons had made. These barons had come armed to the king's council in London on 6 January. Although most of the earls stood aloof, the party clearly was a political and military force to be reckoned with. It included a strong north-country element, but we cannot guess its numbers or composition. Eustace de Vescy, Richard de Percy, Robert fitzWalter were among the leaders. They had asked the king to confirm their ancient liberties, as contained in his predecessors' charters and implicit in his coronation-oath.¹ The king had reacted violently. He had tried to make the malcontents withdraw their demand and give security that they would not renew it. This they would not do. Eventually, the king had

¹ Cf. the report of Walter Mauclerc from the Curia in March 1215 (T. Rymer, *Foedera* (Record Commission ed.), i. i. 120). Roger Wendover and "Walter of Coventry" both say that the coronation-charter of Henry I was brought to the fore at this stage.

promised to give them safe-conduct to and from Northampton, where, on Low Sunday, 26 April, he would give his answer.

John had played for time, and the records show that between January and April he was not inactive. He was fetching troops from abroad, stocking his castles with food and ammunition, making siege-weapons and, in short, preparing for war. The business of the law-courts diminished and the enrolment of charters in chancery ceased entirely for ten weeks.¹ Chroniclers suggest that the king's court was deserted by most of those prelates and nobles who usually frequented it. But meanwhile, the king was making concessions to individuals, which might detach them from the opposition, and he used Archbishop Stephen Langton and the bishops and the veteran William Marshal, earl of Pembroke, to negotiate with the "northerners", as the malcontents are almost invariably described. One meeting may have taken place at Oxford on 22 February, another at the same place on 13 April.²

Both sides recognized (better than some modern historians have done) the importance of interesting the king's new overlord, Pope Innocent III. They had sent their respective envoys off to Rome soon after the meeting in January. But these *démarches* could only produce results later on, for the journey to and from Rome in winter-time would scarcely take less than three months and, in this instance, took longer. We must leave them, for the present, on the path to Rome. Then, on 4 March, King John took a step which all acknowledged to be a master-stroke of diplomacy. He took the Cross as a Crusader. It put him and his possessions under the special protection of the Church and rendered liable to anathema those who interfered with him.

II

By the time Easter came both the king and his opponents apparently were dubious of settling the matter peaceably. If we may credit "Walter of Coventry", the harsh reply which

¹ Between 9 February and 22 April.

² *Rotuli litterarum patentium*, ed. T. D. Hardy (Record Comm.), p. 129a; *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey* (Rolls Series), ii. 124-5.

the king had returned to the barons' proposals in recent parleys made them hurry to fortify their castles, look for allies, and prepare horses and arms. So they came armed to the appointed meeting-place, Northampton, on Low Sunday, 26 April. We hear from chroniclers of a first assembly of northern barons at Stamford in Easter week.¹ Thence they moved to Northampton where they were joined by Giles, bishop of Hereford, Geoffrey de Mandeville, Robert fitzWalter, and many others—presumably those whose strength, like these great lords', lay in East Anglia. The opposition came chiefly, though not entirely, from the north and east of the country.² The king made no attempt to keep the appointment. Having gone as far north as his stronghold of Nottingham late in March, he came southwards at the beginning of April and stayed in the Thames valley and farther south. Easter he spent at London, and during Easter-week moved through Hampshire to his hunting-box of Clarendon, near Salisbury. Nevertheless, before leaving London on Thursday, 23 April, he issued letters of safe-conduct for those who should come with the archbishop of Canterbury or bearing letters from him to speak with the king.³ The safe-conduct was to last for five weeks—until Ascension day, 28 May.

Stephen Langton was still working for a peaceful settlement, but for the course of his negotiations there are few clues.⁴ Our account of the fortnight after 26 April, therefore, may well be faulty in detail.

According to Roger Wendover, on the day after Low Sunday the malcontents moved to Brackley, some twenty miles to the south-west of Northampton. There (or nearby)⁵ they met the

¹ Wendover, in Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora* (Rolls Series), ii. 585 and "Walter of Coventry", *Memoriale* (Rolls Series), ii. 219. Sir James Ramsay (*The Angevin Empire* (1903), pp. 470–2) places this and succeeding events much earlier. His arguments for dating the barons' diffidation about 13 April are not cogent. Professor Sidney Painter, *The Reign of King John* (Baltimore, 1949), p. 288, puts the meeting at Stamford in mid-April.

² Painter, op. cit. pp. 287–90.

³ *Rot. lit. pat.* p. 134a.

⁴ He was engaged in the negotiations of 22 February and 13 April, and between those two dates he is found in Norfolk (Gaywood, 31 March) and Herts (Little Wymondley, 6 April): see *Acta Stephani Langton*, ed. K. Major (Canterbury and York Soc., 1950), nos. 13, 14.

⁵ "Walter of Coventry", ii. 219.

archbishop, the earl of Pembroke, and other representatives of the king. The malcontents had now set down in writing their demands, largely for "old laws and customs of the realm", which were to be found in the coronation-charter of Henry I and the so-called Laws of Edward the Confessor. They asked that the document embodying their demands should be confirmed at once by the king's seal; otherwise they would resort to force. Wendover is not a writer on whom we can rely for accuracy in describing a transaction of this sort: but it is altogether probable that at this juncture a demand was made in writing. To suppose, with Sir James Ramsay, that the demand was "doubtless the Articles subsequently produced at Runnymede" is to go far beyond the evidence, but we can best explain the impasse which was reached if we suppose that the baronial document included a demand for a restrictive council of some sort.

This demand, which may be dated 27 April, had to be conveyed to the king, who was then making his way rapidly from Corfe, through Clarendon and Marlborough, to Wallingford. He reached Wallingford (if the chancery-roll can be trusted to give the king's itinerary) late on Thursday, 30 April. Wallingford is about thirty-four miles from Brackley. There, I suggest, he received the malcontents' demand and threat. On the same day, as the patent roll shows, he wrote to Walter de Lacy, John de Monmouth, Hugh de Mortimer, Walter de Clifford, and "other barons at Gloucester", requesting them to be at Cirencester on Monday next, well equipped with horses and arms and all the men they could muster, there to await the king's command. Without going into questions of military strategy I may point out in passing the importance of Cirencester at a key-point east of the main Cotswold ridge.

At this critical juncture an event occurred which prompted the king, if he needed prompting, to reject the malcontents' demands and make counter-proposals. The evidence points to this week after Low Sunday—about the end of April—as the moment when the king's messengers returned from Rome. Precisely when they arrived and what they brought with them are far from clear; but we shall not be wrong in placing their

arrival in this week¹ and in making them the carriers of two letters, which were later transcribed upon the dorse of the patent roll. Both these letters are dated at the Lateran, 19 March.² One letter, addressed to the magnates and barons of England, ordered them to abandon conspiracies and show of force against the king, to render their due service to him, and, if they had requests to make, to make them respectfully. The second surviving letter was directed to Archbishop Stephen and his suffragans. It upbraided them for failing to mediate in the dispute between king and barons, and stated that they were suspected of giving help and favour to the king's opponents : they were to condemn conspiracies and forbid them under pain of excommunication. In both these letters the Pope said that he had written to the king asking him to treat the barons kindly and hear their just petitions graciously. The letter to the king on behalf of the barons does not survive ; presumably it was brought by the barons' messengers at about the same time.³ Besides these three hortatory letters the Pope, it seems, also sent to the disputants terms of agreement which he had propounded and to which the barons' messengers at the Curia had agreed.⁴ A few months later the Pope's commissioners spoke of these "three-fold peace-terms (*triplex forma pacis*) which were thoroughly honourable and reasonable and worthy of acceptance by God-fearing men".⁵ From later letters of the Pope we learn that one of the proposals was for the king to "grant the barons full safe-conduct, . . .

¹ A writ of *computate* in favour of Thomas of Erdinton suggests that he was back to his normal activities by 7 May (*Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum*, ed. T.D. Hardy (Record Comm.), i. 199a), completed by an unpublished fragment of the roll. Brother Alan Martel appears on 14 May (*Rot. lit. pat.*, p. 135b). Sir Maurice Powicke suggested that the letters might not have reached England before the seizure of London on 17 May (*Stephen Langton* (Oxford, 1928), p. 131 and n. 4), but the terms of the later papal letter ("interim prefatis nuntiis revertentibus") seem to date their arrival much earlier.

² *Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III Concerning England*, ed. C. R. Cheney and W. H. Semple (1953), pp. 194, 196 (and in *Foedera*, i. i. 127).

³ See Walter of Coventry's evidence, below.

⁴ This agreement is stated in the Pope's letter of 18 June (*Magna Carta Commemoration Essays*, ed. H. E. Malden (1917), p. 44).

⁵ *English Historical Review*, xliv (1929), 92. Mr. Painter has pointed out that this cannot refer to Magna Carta, as Powicke and Richardson supposed (*The Reign of King John*, pp. 345-6, and cf. my remarks, *ante*, xxxiii (1950), 35-6).

so that if they could not arrive at agreement the dispute might be decided in his court by their peers according to the laws and customs of the kingdom".¹ This proposal, although made by the Pope, must surely have been inserted in the papal *triplex forma* at the instance of the barons' messengers. But what more was included we cannot say.

John told the Pope that he offered to accept these terms and that the barons refused to agree to them.² Wendover says nothing of this, but since his object was to make a dramatic story and to represent the king as wholly intransigent, his silence is not fatal. It is to be noted that "Walter of Coventry" says that the Pope's letters, to the king "pro baronibus" and to the archbishop "pro rege", were produced in the discussions between the king's representatives and the barons before the latter defied the king. He does not mention the letter to the barons "pro rege" or the *triplex forma*, but it seems most probable that when the first two letters came under discussion, the third letter and the *forma* were also produced. This is borne out by the words of the Pope's commissioners in England who afterwards said that the barons defied their lord *contra triplicem formam pacis*.³

We may assume, then, that the offer was made. We can only guess why the barons rejected the king's offer and what part of their earlier proposal was objectionable to the king. The impasse is explicable if the barons were already insisting upon the sort of supervision over the Crown which was eventually effected by the security clause of Magna Carta.⁴

The malcontents had sent their demands to the king by the hands of the archbishop and the earl of Pembroke in the week

¹ *Selected Letters*, p. 214 (24 August) and the letter of 18 June cited above.

² *Foedera*, i. i. 129. Objection may not only have been raised by the "opposition" barons.

³ "Walter of Coventry", ii. 219; *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xliv. 92. Note that the Pope's letter of 24 August suggests that before the messengers bearing the *forma* reached England, the barons had defied the king. But the English chronicles and the Pope's commissioners in England may have been better informed of the sequence of events.

⁴ Painter, op. cit. pp. 315-6. Dr. A. L. Poole takes a different view in *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta* (Oxford, 1951), p. 473.

following Low Sunday. I have suggested that he received and rejected them on Thursday, 30 April at Wallingford. If the barons waited at Brackley, they can hardly have received the king's reply and counter-proposals before 1 or 2 May. Another day may well have been spent in discussing the situation and then the barons took the decisive step of diffidation : they "defied" the king, in the sense of formally renouncing their homage and fealty. It was a declaration of war.

The annals of Southwark report that war broke out between the king and the northern barons about the feast of the Invention of the Holy Cross (that is, about Sunday, 3 May), and that the barons defied the king by an Austin canon at Reading on 5 May.¹ It must have been an uncomfortable mission, best undertaken by someone who had the protection of the monastic habit. On receiving the barons' diffidation, the king declared that he held the land as patrimony of St. Peter (in other words, as a fief from the Pope) and that as a Crusader he should benefit from the Crusaders' privilege. He appealed against disturbers of the peace through the earls of Pembroke and Warenne.²

Meanwhile, the malcontents marched back in battle-formation to Northampton, where they laid siege to the royal castle whose castellan was a Poitevin soldier, Geoffrey de Martigny. As the attackers had no siege-weapons, they sat before the castle in vain for a week or two.³ If we may trust Wendover, the rebels straightway appointed the great East Anglian lord Robert

¹ M. Tyson, "The Annals of Southwark and Merton", *Surrey Archaeol. Collections*, xxxvi. 49. Tewkesbury annals say that "turbatio magna" arose on 1 May (*Annales monastici* (Rolls Series), i. 61). If the canon left Brackley on 3 May to go to the king where he was last known to be, i.e. Wallingford, he would find on arrival that the king had left for Reading (18 miles away) on 2 May. The Dunstable annals say that a canon of Dereham (O. Praem.) was sent to the king at Wallingford (*ibid.* iii. 43). Praestita Roll 16 John m. 6 confirms the evidence of the chancery rolls that John was at Reading on 5 May.

² This is how I interpret the king's letter to the Pope of 29 May which does not, however, mention the diffidation (*Foedera*, i. i. 129). The earls of Pembroke and Warenne were with the king on 5 May (*Rotuli chartarum*, ed. T. D. Hardy (Record Comm.), p. 206b); neither attests a charter of 6 May; Pembroke does not witness charters of 7 and 9 May.

³ Wendover says: a fortnight, but a writer who puts the capture of London a week too late cannot be trusted here.

fitzWalter as their commander-in-chief and he took the high-sounding title of "Marshal of the army of God".¹ Did Robert or any of his fellows really believe that they were about to wage a holy war? The title is intriguing. In 1212, to be sure, Robert had associated his opposition to John with the grievances of the Church against an excommunicate king. It was less easy to take this line in 1215 when the king was the Pope's vassal and a Crusader. But the rebels had one of the bishops committed to their cause and they found in Langton a sympathetic mediator with the king.

III

With 5 May, then, civil war seems to have broken out. Northampton castle was besieged by rebels and we might expect the king to take violent action. But he still held his hand. The records show that the earlier preparations for war were continuing; one would never guess from them that hostilities had begun. Not until 9 May does the chancery take note of the state of affairs by referring to "the barons opposed to us" (*barones nobis adversantes*), and a fragmentary copy of a letter of the same day shows the first hostile act on the king's part: Philip of Worcester is to have possession of "the manor of Ditton, which belonged to Geoffrey de Mandeville".²

Why did the king hold his hand? There may have been adequate military reasons which are obscure to us, and John and his advisers may still have had hopes of settlement. He was evidently persuaded to go a long way towards meeting reasonable complaints. His own version of what followed, as

¹ M. Paris, *Chronica maiora*, ii. 586. Coggeshall gives Robert the same title and Robert uses it officially a little later (*Foedera*, i. i. 133, cf. *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xliv. 92). Walter of Coventry speaks of the appointment of "marshals of the army of God", and the London chronicle (*De antiquis legibus* (Camden Soc., 1846), p. 201) says that Robert fitzWalter and Geoffrey de Mandeville were appointed marshals.

² Public Record Office, Close Roll 16 John (C. 54/9) m. 1. Mr. Jolliffe notes that Geoffrey's lands had been taken in hand in July 1214 for failure to keep his terms at the Exchequer in the matter of the Gloucester inheritance (*Angevin Kingship* (1955), p. 333). But Geoffrey regained seisin by writs of 9–10 August 1214 (*Rot. lit. claus.* i. 209b–210) and the record of 9 May must relate to a new disseisin if we interpret it correctly.

contained in a letter of 29 May to the Pope, is anything but clear. Fortunately, the chancery rolls enable us to confirm and date his proposition, conveyed to the rebels by the archbishop and two or three bishops, that each side should choose four arbiters who, with the Pope as president, should settle all complaints about liberties which the rebels might bring forward. A charter to this effect was drafted, with the date 9 May.¹ This document, seldom quoted, is of interest for two reasons. It refers to "questionibus et articulis que petunt a nobis et que ipsi proponent", which recalls the title: "Capitula que barones petunt et dominus rex concedit" which heads the Articles of the Barons. Also, it reserves to the king interim rights to fines and debts and services which he enjoyed "before the disagreement (*discordia*) arose". But this charter did not protect the barons from the king's displeasure pending arbitration. Next day it was re-drafted as letters patent with the proviso (made famous later on by the words of *Magna Carta*) that the king would not take the barons or their men nor dispossess them nor go against them with force and arms except according to the law of the realm or by judgement of their peers in the king's court *until* the arbitrators should give their decision.² At the same time the king offered Geoffrey de Mandeville and Giles de Braose, bishop of Hereford, the judgement of his court respecting the enormous sums charged upon them as reliefs for the Gloucester and Braose inheritances.³ The king also granted his fifth charter to the citizens of London, empowering them to appoint their mayor by annual election; but simultaneously he pressed forward the fortification of the city⁴ and the manning of his castles throughout the country.

He had every reason to do so. By Tuesday, 12 May, he

¹ *Rot. Chart.* p. 209b (the dorso of the roll). Note the connection with the *triplex forma*. If the *forma* only reached the king after the barons' diffidation, the fact might help to explain these continuing negotiations. But see p. 317 n. 3.

² *Rot. lit. pat.*, p 141a (the dorso of the roll).

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ The two documents printed by Mary Bateson from "A London municipal collection" (*Eng. Hist. Rev.* xvii (1902), 726-8) may well belong to this time when the citizens were being encouraged to look to the defences and were themselves framing their *desiderata*.

heard that his latest proposal to the rebels was rejected.¹ This is implied by the writ of that date to all sheriffs of England ordering them immediately to seize the lands and chattels of the king's "enemies" and to submit returns and valuations to the king. Two days later the king began to grant the lands of rebels to his supporters: William de Mandeville's estates in Devon to Henry fitzCount, the lands of Robert de Vere in Devon to Reginald de Vautort, and so on. In the case of all but the most important rebels this action may have been a threat in order to recall them to loyalty. Thus, Simon of Pateshull's manor of Wasden (Bucks) was granted to Robert de Courtenay on 15 May; but within a week, on the intercession of the abbot of Woburn, Simon had a royal letter of safe-conduct to come and make peace with the king. Henry of Braybrook's manors of Horsendon and Corby were also seized; but on 17 May Henry had safe-conduct offered to him to come and speak with the king.² At this stage, indeed, John may still have entertained hopes of dividing and pacifying the rebels. For on 16 May he instructed Geoffrey of Martigny and the others to observe a truce if the archbishop of Canterbury should announce one, to be effective until Thursday 21 May or later.³

But no such truce was made. For early on Sunday morning, 17 May,⁴ some of the rebels arrived at London, having come from Northampton through Bedford, where the castle was delivered to them by its castellan, William de Beauchamp. The rebels had friends in the city, who aided their entry, and there was little resistance by the Londoners. Doubtless a strong element sympathized with the barons or saw in their

¹ If the proposals of 10 May were sent to the barons at Northampton there must have been some hard riding in both directions: Windsor to Northampton and thence to the king at Wallingford. These proposals may explain the note "v idus Maii ad Norhamtun" added in the margin to the poetic account of negotiations in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, facs. ed. by A. O. and M. O. Anderson (1936), pl. 60 (fo. 3lv); but it is the wrong date, if we are right in putting the barons' diffidation on 5 May.

² *Rot. lit. claus.* i. 200a and *Rot. lit. pat.* pp. 136b, 138a. It is unlikely that either Simon or Henry availed himself of the offer; their reconciliation only came later. Martin of Pateshull had safe-conduct on 2 June.

³ *Rot. lit. pat.* p. 136b.

⁴ *Foedera*, i. i. 121.

alliance an opportunity to realize civic ambitions. William, earl of Salisbury, who had been directed to London on the day before it fell, was too late to intervene, likewise some Flemish soldiery under Robert de Bethune and others.¹

London already had the prestige of a capital city and the news of its capture must have made a deep impression in the country. Wendover is not likely to have fabricated the story that from London the rebels sent persuasive and minatory letters, urging the other barons to join them.² The king's situation must have seemed critical; and John's material superiority in wealth, trained soldiery, and fortified places over the scattered resources of an ill-organised opposition is perhaps more evident to us than it was to contemporaries. There were sporadic outbreaks in other parts of the country, at Lincoln and at Exeter, and on the North Welsh march a raid in considerable force by Llewellyn ap Iorwerth surprised the town and castle of Shrewsbury.³ The rebels felt strong enough to attempt some sort of shrieval organization in the counties where they were predominant. The king, deprived of much of his normal revenue, left his castellans to maintain their garrisons by levying protection-money from the countryside. He was at a severe disadvantage because he did not know on whom to rely. Thus, on 29 May the king ordered that "if Hugh de Beauchamp is our enemy and with our enemies, then his lands in Cornwall are granted to Hasculf de Suleny".⁴ Two days later he apparently still counted on the loyalty of John de Lacy, the young constable of Chester,⁵ whose heavy debts he had remitted over two months ago. But within three weeks John de Lacy was sufficiently deeply implicated with the rebels to be chosen as one of the council of twenty-five.

¹ R. de Coggeshall, *Chronicon anglicanum* (Rolls Series), p. 171; *Rot. lit. pat.* p. 136b; *Histoire des ducs de Normandie et des rois d'Angleterre*, ed. F. Michel (Soc. de l'hist. de France, 1840), p. 147.

² M. Paris, *Chron. maiora*, ii. 587-8; cf. Coggeshall, loc. cit.

³ Reginald de Braose made trouble in the southern march, but whether this synchronized with these other events is doubtful (*Brut y Tywysogion*, trans. T. Jones (Cardiff, 1952), p. 90; cf. J. Lloyd, *History of Wales*, ii. 643-5).

⁴ *Rot. lit. claus.* i. 213b.

⁵ *Rot. lit. pat.* p. 142b, cf. 129b. Mr Painter doubts Wendover's statement that John de Lacy was with the barons at Stamford (op. cit. p. 288).

After the fall of London on 17 May neither party embarked on hostilities on a big scale.¹ On 29 May another royal proposal was made to the rebels. This we learn from a letter addressed by King John to the Pope.² A clerk of the papal camera had arrived at the king's court at Odiham that same day, the Friday after Ascension Day ; he brought (almost certainly) the Pope's reply to John's announcement that he had taken the Cross. The bishops of Worcester and Coventry were present at court and Saer de Quincy, earl of Winchester, was probably there under safe-conduct, representing the rebels.³ In the presence of the papal clerk the king offered (so he says) to submit to the Pope's arbitration in the matter of all the petitions the rebels were making, so that the Pope, holding the plenitude of power, might order what should be just. The barons, he says, refused this offer. "Therefore, pious father," concludes John's letter, "we have thought fit to tell you all this in order that you, with your customary kindness, may order things as seems expedient to you." This invitation to the Pope (dated 29 May) is not without interest in the light of the next few months' events.

Stephen Langton is not named as being present at this encounter of 29 May. Where he was during these weeks is not known, but he was still actively working for peace. As on 16 May, so on the 27, various of John's captains were told to keep truce with the king's barons according as the archbishop of Canterbury should require by his letters patent ; and on the same day the archbishop had safe-conduct with all those whom he should bring to Staines to treat of peace between the king and his barons.⁴ If this safe-conduct was immediately used, the fact is not recorded ; but according to the king's itinerary John was near at hand, at Windsor, from 31 May to 3 June. Thence he went to Winchester for Whitsun,⁵ but may have been brought back by fresh proposals for a meeting. On Monday, 8 June,

¹ There was disorder in London, and at the end of May John took reprisals against the citizens of Northampton (Walter of Coventry, ii. 220; *Rot. lit. claus.* i. 214a).

² *Foedera*, i. i. 129. For a letter probably enclosed in the Pope's letter to which John's letter was the reply see *Selected letters*, pp. 203-4.

³ *Rot. lit. pat.* p. 138b.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 142a.

⁵ Apparently without taking the great seal.

being at Merton, he issued safe-conduct for those who should come next day to Staines on behalf of the barons to make peace, the safe-conduct to last until Thursday the 11th. The king followed up this letter two days later by announcing to his captains that "the aforesaid truce" was extended from Thursday to the following Monday, 15 June.¹

And so we reach the last stage in the preparation of Magna Carta.

IV

It is, of all the stages, the most debated and the hardest to establish. We shall never know the whole truth about these days of mid-June. But the generally accepted chronology will, I am convinced, repay scrutiny.

What may be called the orthodox view can be briefly stated.² The rebels did not come to the king until the last day for which their recorded safe-conduct was valid : 15 June in the meadows of Runnymede, between Windsor and Staines. There they presented their proposals which were written on a sheet of vellum (about 20 in. × 10½ in.) which still survives, with the title : "These are the articles (*capitula*) which the barons request and which the king grants." The document received there and then the royal seal whereby it became a warrant for the chancellor to issue Magna Carta. The charter is dated 15 June ; but, it is argued, it is too lengthy a document to have been prepared and engrossed all in a day and it varies in some particulars from the Articles. Therefore, the date when it was actually completed and handed over must be 19 June, which is the day upon which (according to several royal writs) "firm peace" was made between the king and his barons.

On this view one or two preliminary observations must be made. First, the Articles do not constitute a chancery warrant.³

¹ *Rot. lit. pat.* pp. 142–3.

² See W. S. McKechnie, *Magna Carta*, 2nd edn. (Glasgow, 1914) and C. G. Crump, "The execution of the Great Charter", *History*, n. s. xiii (1928), 251 ; J. C. Dickinson, *The Great Charter* (Historical Association pamphlet G.31, 1955), pp. 13, 16 ; cf. A. J. Collins, "The documents of the Great Charter 1215", *Proceedings of the British Academy*, xxxiv. 234, 244, 248, 258.

³ Cf. V. H. Galbraith, *Studies in the Public Records* (1948), p. 135. As Mr. Collins observes (loc. cit. p. 224), the chancery could not be responsible for all the differences between the Articles and the Charter.

The affixing to them of the Great Seal simply amounted to a promise by the king that a charter would be made on the basis of the Articles' demands and suggestions. Secondly, the assignment of the date 19 June to the Charter—that being the day when "firm peace" was proclaimed—assumes that the completion of a charter was an essential preliminary to the announcement of firm peace. This seems to me a big and unwarrantable assumption. Documents describe the peace which has been made without mentioning the charter.¹ It was needed, certainly, to confirm the promises made when the king set his seal to the Articles, and to provide a document to be permanently preserved; but its completion was not the most urgent need, from the point of view of a group of extremist barons of whom each had his own grievances and of whom probably none believed that the king's good faith was guaranteed by a piece of vellum. They understood better a system of oaths, hostages, and sureties.

With these considerations in mind, let us look at the positive evidence, such as it is.

The Articles of the Barons are undated. We do not know either how long the document existed before it received the seal or when the sealing took place. So far as internal evidence goes, it reflects other interests besides those of the extremist barons. With its reference to London and merchants and trade it is highly improbable that it could have been finally framed before London joined the opposition in the second half of May; and the careful draftsmanship and breadth of scope suggest that Langton and other negotiators of moderate opinions had said their say.² On the other hand, the security clause, which set up twenty-five barons to control the king, was a

¹ It is only mentioned in the draft writ dated 19 June which orders its publication (cf. below, p. 326). As will be seen, copies of this writ were delivered out of the chancery in advance of copies of the Charter.

² Mr. Collins's important discovery that the sealed Articles found their way into the Canterbury archives adds to the probability that the archbishop played a leading part. But while ch. 46 of the Articles provided for arbitration by the archbishop and his nominees, the Charter (ch. 59) requires, instead, judgment by the king's court. This looks like a change made by the king or his advisers who mistrusted Langton.

condition most obnoxious to the king, who can hardly have accepted it at sight.

Then we have Magna Carta itself, which is dated in the meadow called Runnymede between Windsor and Staines on 15 June. McKechnie explained this by asserting that in John's reign "elaborate charters, which occupied time in preparation, usually bore the date, not of their actual execution, but of the day on which occurred the transactions they record".¹ It may be so; but McKechnie produced no evidence, and studies of the chancery's practice in John's reign have so far failed to reveal what system was used for dating either original instruments or their enrolments.

What other record-evidence is there? Hundreds of chancery writs were enrolled during the month of June. None shows the king to have been at Runnymede before 18 June: only Magna Carta (whose real date is dubious) declares him to be there on the 15th. Moreover, the only writ dated at Runnymede on Thursday, 18 June, is the letter patent to Stephen Harengod announcing that firm peace has been made on Friday, 19 June!² All other letters given on 18 June are dated, like those of 10-17 June, from Windsor. Then for six days the activity of the chancery was divided between Windsor and Runnymede. The latest writ from Runnymede is dated 23 June.

Among these writs several refer to the "firm peace" made between king and barons on Friday, 19 June. One of them³ also informs sheriffs and other royal officers that a charter has been made and that it is to be read publicly and firmly maintained. Arrangements are then made for implementing certain regulations common to the Articles of the Barons and Magna

¹ McKechnie, *op. cit.* pp. 40-1, cf. Mr. Collins's caveat, *loc. cit.* p. 235, n. 1.

² McKechnie brushes aside the discrepancy; assuming the error of "xviii" for "xxiii" in the date as a "certainty" (p. 41, n. 1), he prints the text with the date 23 June (p. 493). Mr. Collins tacitly accepts this emendation (p. 244, n. 2). But the error, if it be an error, was not made at enrolment, for this letter appears on a chronologically-arranged roll between letters of 18 and 19 June (*Rot. lit. pat.*, p. 143b. Cf. *ibid.* p. 142a, where a receipt is dated 28 May for property received on 29 May).

³ *Rot. lit. pat.* p. 180b and McKechnie, p. 494. Facsimile in Collins, pl. 14.

Carta.¹ The date is Runnymede, 19 June. Following the enrolled copy of this writ, which is on the dorse of the roll, is a memorandum that certain named persons received copies of the aforesaid "draft" (*forma*) and copies of the Charter. No date is assigned to the record of the first twenty-one deliveries (all of them writs); then comes a dated record of delivery of both writs and charters to the bishop of Lincoln on St. John the Baptist's day (24 June). This is followed by other undated entries until the last: "Also at Oxford on Wednesday the feast of St. Mary Magdalen (22 July) were delivered to Master Elias of Dereham six charters." In all, thirty-five writs and thirteen charters had been issued by this date, if this memorandum is complete. It is to be observed that the writ, though fully dated, has a generalized address. Either it is a draft or it is copied from a draft. If 19 June saw firm peace established that was certainly the day to compose such a letter as this for general distribution. But we cannot assume from the date on the draft that the letter was actually despatched on that day.² All we can safely say is that twenty-one writs were delivered out of chancery before 24 June, the date at which we have clear official evidence for the first time that copies of the charter were in existence, for two were then handed over to the bishop of Lincoln.

Do the thirteenth-century narrative-writers throw light on the events of June 1215? Very few of them are sufficiently precise to be of service and when they are precise they are not always convincing. Modern historians have gone for details as a rule to Roger Wendover. Wendover describes the king's meeting with the barons in the meadows on 15 June;³ but he does so in a context which suggests that his narrative is simply embroidery upon the dated charter which he had before him.

The Annals of Melrose⁴ contain a rhymed poem about the

¹ The word *prave* is applied to *consuetudines* as in Articles, ch. 39, not *male* as in Charter, ch. 48. On the other hand, the reference to abolishing (*delendis*) customs resembles the Charter more than the Articles.

² Mr. H. G. Richardson says cautiously: "some perhaps were actually despatched on that day" ("The morrow of the Great Charter", *ante*, xxviii (1944), 428).

³ M. Paris, *Chron. maiora*, ii. 589.

⁴ Facs. edition, pl. 60 (fo. 3 lv).

troubles of this year. It says that peace-terms (*forma pacis*) were presented to the king and that the king refused to accept the terms until, being forced, he conceded everything. Against the words "formam pacis" the contemporary annotator puts the date : 18 June in the meadow of Staines.

The Annals of Dunstable¹ do not discuss or even mention the charter, but simply say that peace was made at Runnymede on the feast of SS. Gervase and Protasius (i.e. 19 June).

The Annals of Southwark² give a later date for the making of peace : Tuesday before the feast of St. John the Baptist (i.e. 23 June); and the Annals of Waverley³ say that it was on this day that the king, archbishops, bishops, magnates, and barons met at Runnymede, where the king made the charter of liberties they wanted.

Finally, there is the story of the *Histoire des ducs de Normandie et des rois d'Angleterre*, which represents the information available to the mercenary troops brought over from Flanders for the king's service.⁴ It is confusing in the extreme. It tells of an expedition headed by Earl William of Salisbury and Robert de Bethune to put down a rising in Devonshire. They turned back once on hearing of the rebels' superior strength. Their departure from Winchester for the second time can be probably dated 6 or 7 June.⁵ They marched to Exeter (a distance of about 112 miles), spent four days there, and then returned to the king. In their absence, the king (says the author) met the barons at Staines without waiting to consult his half-brother, the earl, or the Flemings, and he made a shameful peace (*vilaine pais*). Now Earl William appears in the preamble of Magna Carta as one of

¹ *Ann. monastici*, iii. 43.

² Loc. cit. p. 49. The Merton annals and the London "Liber de antiquis legibus" agree, as was to be expected.

³ *Ann. monastici*, ii. 283.

⁴ pp. 147-9.

⁵ Miss Norgate reckoned that the first expedition set out from Freemantle (Southampton) c. 19-20 May and the second, from Winchester, on 24 May. But the troops had only landed in Kent on 16 May and this scheme seems to allow too little time. The king was at Winchester also 5-8 June and on 6 June ordered Faukes de Breauté to send to the earl of Salisbury 400 Welshmen, to be at Salisbury on 9 June (*Rot. lit. claus.* p. 214 a). On 8 June the king was already arranging an immediate truce (above, p. 324).

the king's counsellors by whose advice the charter was granted. But if William went to Exeter on 6 June he could not be at Runnymede by 15 June ; he could, indeed, hardly have reached this point by the 19th, and a letter from the king of that date confirms the presumption that he was still absent from court.¹

What does all this evidence amount to ? It gives no certainty about the genesis of the charter but it suggests other possibilities besides (and in preference to) the usually proposed sequence : the Articles sealed on Monday 15 April, the charter sealed on Friday the 19th.

First, the hypothesis of an earlier dating of events must be considered, even if we have later to reject it. The datelessness of the Articles permits the hypothesis that they were the result of discussions between the king's representatives and the rebels towards the end of May,² and that they were presented to the king about Whitsun (7 June). The king, having decided by 8 June to agree to them, summoned the barons to be at Staines on 9 June : there and then he signified his agreement by having the great seal affixed to the Articles.³ (It may be added that probably the king would not deign to negotiate in person or, at the most, would only meet the rebels to ratify the articles which his representatives had accepted on his behalf.) But much remained to be done before either the Articles were turned into the charter or the immediate conditions for peace were fulfilled. So the safe-conduct of the barons was prolonged, discussions continued, and the Charter was hammered out of the Articles on Monday, 15 June, as the charter itself proclaims.

I do not see how this hypothesis can be disproved. It has the advantage of requiring no elaborate explanation of the date set upon the charter. That date is taken at its face-value. On the other hand, there is no record-evidence that the rebels came to Staines or to Runnymede before Monday, 15 June ; except for Wendover, no narrative-writer who provides dates regarded

¹ *Rot. lit. claus.* p. 215a. He does not witness a charter at Windsor, 25 June, but witnesses charters at Winchester two days later.

² According to Wendover, William Marshal went to London to treat with the rebels.

³ Langton was apparently with the king at Windsor on 9 June (*Mem. of St. Edmund's*, ii. 124, cf. *Histoire des ducs*, p. 149).

the 15th as a significant date. And if the Articles were sealed before that day, either the list of counsellors in the preamble to *Magna Carta* errs in including William, earl of Salisbury, or the *Histoire des ducs* is at fault in a detail where we should expect it to be accurate when it says that the earl was absent.¹ Moreover, it may be questioned whether a solemn charter of this sort would be finally drafted before the king took the homage of the barons who had defied him. He only took homages on 19 June, the day of the official, ceremonial peace-making. Finally, this hypothesis leaves a sort of vacuum between the events of Monday and the ceremonies of Friday: the king is unrecorded at Runnymede and the chancery issues from Windsor a bare dozen letters, of which only two or three concern pacification; this is in strong contrast to the activity of the next few days (19–23 June).²

An alternative reading of the evidence seems to be preferable. It may be that the prolongation of the "truce" till 15 June, of which the king notified his captains on the 10th, meant that the rebels had not yet moved to Staines. (For had they arrived sooner, their stay at Runnymede would have ceased to concern the king's captains in other parts of the country.) Let us, then, suppose that the peace-terms, already debated between the king's representatives and the rebels during the preceding week, were brought to Runnymede on 15 June. A meeting with the king had been arranged on the understanding that he would agree to the Articles as we know them. The king rode to Runnymede on that day. A fair copy of the Articles was written, neatly enough in an official-looking clerkly hand, but perhaps hastily, for a few purely scribal omissions are corrected by interlineation. Also a few last-minute additions were made, and then the document received the royal seal, either at Windsor or at Runnymede.³ Thus far, the accepted view seems plausible: that is, the Articles were sealed on 15 June.

¹ Though William might have urged agreement to the Articles when they were put to the king at an earlier stage.

² Fifty-four letters close and twenty-three letters patent. It might be argued that they were putting into effect at the earliest moment arrangements made before the ceremonial peace-making.

³ See the original and cf. Blackstone, *op. cit.* p. xvii. The document itself is as silent about the place as about the time of its completion.

But the Articles, apart from being only the first documentary step towards Magna Carta,¹ only represent one part of the work which the negotiators had to accomplish. To express in a generalized form the principles of sound government, as then commonly conceived, even if "politically inept",² was no small achievement. But the appeasement of aggrieved individuals was fully as important a task, and the acceptance of the Articles by the king was not, of itself, sufficient to reconcile the extremists. Three more days, from Monday, 15 June to Thursday, the 18th were (on this hypothesis) consumed in debate and bargaining. The canons of St. David's found their opportunity in the king's embarrassment and got his assent to their election of a Welshman as bishop. The canons of York got permission to proceed to an election.³ By Thursday the 18th the barons were ready to render their homage again and the scene was set for formal reconciliation with the king in person on Friday 19th. The peace-making took place, as recorded in several writs. The king received the barons with the kiss of peace. Since this was a bit of ceremonial to which all parties had agreed, the notice of it (like some modern newspaper reports or minutes of meetings) could be prepared before the event. That might account for the date, Thursday, 18 June, which appears in the Melrose annals and explain why one of the royal writs announcing that peace had been made on the 19 June is itself dated on the 18th.⁴

But the charter to be composed on the basis of the Articles was as yet unwritten. When it finally appeared, the Articles had undergone much re-drafting, which cannot have been

¹ Apart, that is, from the "Unknown charter of liberties". This, interesting though it is, does not come into my account because I cannot fit it into the events of April-June 1215. Of the various suggestions for its dating which have been made (all of them highly conjectural), I think the earlier dates are the more probable. Professor Galbraith and Dr. Poole, on the other hand, would place it after 9-10 May 1215 (Galbraith, *Studies*, pp. 133-34; A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book*, pp. 471-2). The problem would be much simpler if we had any evidence of the authorship or official character of the document.

² The phrase is Mr. Jolliffe's: *Angevin Kingship*, p. 303.

³ *Rot. lit. pat.* p. 143ab.

⁴ See above, p. 326.

carried out in a hurry.¹ The earliest date at which we hear of written copies of the Charter being in existence is Wednesday, 24 June; the king was apparently at Runnymede intermittently from Thursday, 18 to Tuesday, 23 June. The Annals of Southwark record the peace-making on the latter day. This was the day when tents were struck at Runnymede and it may well have been the day on which the terms of Magna Carta were finally agreed and it was ready to be engrossed and sealed.²

The peace (I have suggested) did not depend mainly on the production of this document. The things which made up the peace were, on the one hand, the king's acceptance of homage from those who had performed diffidation six weeks earlier; on the other hand, the choice of the committee of twenty-five (unrecorded in any official document which has survived),³ and the restoration to the barons of lands, castles, hostages, and so on. Magna Carta consisted mainly of promises for the future: it did not give the individuals who sought it these immediate concessions; they were the subject of numerous letters issued after 19 June, that is, as soon as the barons had renewed their homage. In the patent roll we find them indicated by such marginalia as "Liberacio castri. Deliberacio obsidis. Custodia foreste liberate." The terms of the charter could be settled when these other measures were under way. It is noticeable that Ralph of Coggeshall, a contemporary Cistercian, without providing precise dates, gives a sequence of events which is consistent with this. He describes a meeting on the appointed day at Runnymede, the barons encamped on one side, the king and his followers in tents apart from them. Peace was sworn by both sides "and soon the peace-terms were brought together

¹ Cf. Art. ch. 25 (Magna Carta, ch. 52), 32 (M.C. 12-3), 37 (M.C. 55), 46 (M.C. 59).

² Mr. Richardson considered it "uncertain whether the first fair example, which seems to have been preserved in the treasury of the exchequer, was written and sealed on the 19th", although he adopts the usual view that the Articles were sealed on the 15th and the Charter ratified on the 19th ("The morrow of the Great Charter: an addendum", *ante*, xxix (1945), p. 183).

³ It is for remark that the names of the 25 had apparently not been published when the charter was composed: "concedimus . . . quod barones eligant . ." (ch. 61); cf. Poole, op. cit. p. 472.

in a charter".¹ The Cistercian annals of Waverley, we have seen, assign the making of this charter to 23 June. This seems to me a likely date.

It must be admitted that finality cannot be claimed for this hypothesis. It leaves certain questions unanswered. (1) Like the orthodox view, it assumes that the day on which the Articles were sealed (which we suppose to be 15 June) provided the chancery with a date to set upon the Charter. Yet the Articles were not a warrant, in the ordinary sense, and there must have been a later day when the draft charter was at last prepared, and approved, by the king, which would have served equally well for dating the document. (2) Then there is the dating clause : "Dat' per manum nostram in prato quod vocatur Ronimed." Whatever the significance of the appearance of the king in this formula,² it certainly implies that the king, when he authorized the charter, was at Runnymede. Either this element of the dating clause is to be taken as evidence of an otherwise unattested visit of the king to Runnymede on 15 June, when the great seal was set to the Articles, or it is incompatible with the time-date and refers to the period when the chancery is otherwise known to have been at Runnymede (19–23 June). But we know little of the diplomatic usages of John's chancery. Moreover, the Charter itself was an anomalous instrument and the circumstances—to put it mildly—unusual. These ambiguities of the dating-clause do not invalidate our conjecture, based on the concurrent witness of other records and literary sources. In short, it seems likely that the Articles were prepared in advance of the assembly at Runnymede on 15 June, and were sealed on that day. The work of drafting a charter on the basis of the Articles required further discussions and was only completed on 23 June.

So Magna Carta comes to be disengaged from the recorded ceremonial of 19 June. Had they been more closely bound together, contemporaries might have commented more often

¹ "Mox igitur forma pacis in charta est comprehensa" (*Chronicon anglic.* p. 172).

² It may simply indicate on this occasion that the datary could not be one of the king's subjects, since all were beneficiaries.

upon the Charter. In fact, only a few chroniclers, in describing the establishment of the short-lived peace, take account of the charter's existence ; still fewer seem to know much about its contents. But this does not mean that the Charter was unimportant. It was not merely the record of an antecedent oral transaction ; it was provided for as a necessary complement to the peace-making.¹ In some respects it was an enactment of law, not merely a re-statement of custom. Its concluding clause remained the justification for the activities of the Twenty-five in the following months. Then, too, the Pope's condemnation of Magna Carta stiffened the rebels in the civil war which broke out again in September, and probably drove many moderate men to their ranks. Finally, Magna Carta itself, shorn of its obnoxious sanctions and some dubious clauses, survived the papal thunders : after John's death, in its reissues, it became an instrument of genuine reconciliation and an earnest of good government.

NOTE ON THE EXECUTION OF MAGNA CARTA

In considering the order of events leading to the grant of Magna Carta I have avoided touching on the character of the Charter as a diplomatic instrument. But the tentative conclusion which has been reached above implicitly contradicts a view recently expressed by Mr. A. J. Collins. I must explain why this does not lead me to modify my opinion about the date.

Briefly, Mr. Collins argues that the Charter was inextricably tied up with the barons' resumption of homage, that as it embodied, so to speak, the peace-terms of a treaty, that peace could not be declared without a formal delivery of the Charter to the barons. This delivery to the barons of the Charter, "which was certainly the first exemplar to receive the Great Seal and which may actually have been sealed in their presence", can only have taken place on the day when *firma pax*

¹ Cf. Articles ch. 1 ("exprimendum in carta"), 48 ("infra rationabile tempus determinandum in carta").

was made, i.e. 19 June.¹ On this view, the question of chronology discussed above simply does not arise.

But there are various objections to this view of Magna Carta as a treaty. Diplomatically, it is a royal charter of grant, unlike any contemporary treaty in its form. The nearest approach to the terms of a treaty is in the final record that both king and barons have sworn to observe all the foregoing faithfully. Throughout the document there is no *quid pro quo*: the renewal of homage is not so much as mentioned. In the early thirteenth century a treaty implied an exchange of instruments between the parties. Recognizing this, Mr. Collins—in search for the counterpart of the “treaty” of Magna Carta—produces the Letters testimonial of the prelates.² But the prelates could not be regarded as a party to a treaty, or as representatives of the baronial opposition, and this document of theirs (which survives only in copy in the Red Book of the Exchequer) is a colourless, certified copy of Magna Carta. It is pure assumption that the first sealed exemplar of Magna Carta was handed to “the barons” (presumably in the person of Robert fitzWalter as Marshal of the Army of God); and an assumption of an extremely hazardous sort that the letters testimonial of the prelates were ‘delivered to the Crown’ as a complementary ceremony.

The significance of the prelates’ letter has generally been ignored,³ and deserves a few words. The barons in their Articles (*ad fin.*) had asked the king to guarantee by charters of the archbishops and bishops and Pandulf that he would not obtain revocation or diminution of his undertakings from the Pope.⁴ But how could the representatives of the Church be expected to comply and so seem to set limits on the Pope’s power? The demand was watered down to a very different consistency:

¹ Collins, loc. cit. pp. 244, 245, cf. 246: “robed in the majesty of the deed publicly delivered into the hands of the barons of Runnymede.” Professor Galbraith was not so explicit: “the completed Charter, which when duly sealed figured in the final ceremony of renewing homage” (op. cit. p. 135).

² Collins, loc. cit. p. 245 and pl. 13.

³ Sir John Fox remarked upon it: *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxxix (1924), 332.

⁴ Cf. the security that the barons gave in May 1213 in support of the king’s act of submission to Rome (*Foedera*, I. i. 112).

Magna Carta included the king's personal promise that he would not obtain from anyone revocation or diminution of his grants. Then, at the very end of the security clause, the king states that he has caused to be made for the barons letters patent of the archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin, the bishops named in the preamble, and Master Pandulf, testifying to "this security and the aforesaid grants". Thus, in the drafting of the Charter, the prelates' guarantee has become detached from the specific question of application to the Pope. When this guarantee is drawn up, there is further dilution. The document is a plain *vidimus*, which does no more than certify that the copy of the charter it rehearses is word-perfect. The prelates have avoided acting as guarantors of the king and have avoided expressing approval or disapproval of the transaction (except in so far as approval is implied by including their names in the preamble). Their letter simply prevents an untrustworthy king from tampering with the text of his charter.¹

The terms of the Charter suggest that, once the letter was written (whether in the archbishop's chancery or the royal chancery we cannot tell), it should be held by some representative of the baronial party. But in fact, the only copy with the bishops' seals attached, of which we have record, resided in a hamper of the Treasury of Receipt in or about the year 1323. About then, it was copied into the Red Book of the Exchequer; and Mr. Collins offers reasons for supposing that it was already in the Treasury in 1216.² How or why it came to be preserved there has not been explained.

To return to the problem of the issue of Magna Carta. If the Charter was not tied to the ceremonial of 19 June, what procedure governed its issue? Was there ever any ceremonial delivery to a representative of the beneficiaries, who are described in the injunctive clause as "the men in our realm"? Such proceedings would seem to be unnecessary. Once the Charter had been drafted, a copy might be engrossed and sealed

¹ The royal chancery was capable of issuing doctored documents; see C. Petit-Dutaillis, "Les copies du traité de paix du Goulet (22 Mai 1200). Variantes et falsifications", *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, cii (1941), 35-50.

² Collins, loc. cit. pp. 251-2, and cf. Galbraith, op. cit. pp. 123-4, 139.

for preservation in the Treasury of the Exchequer, for there is some evidence that this had been a method of record in earlier times,¹ but there is no proof that this was done on this occasion. If a sealed copy of the prelates' *vidimus* was deposited, a copy of the Charter itself would be superfluous.

What happened next remains obscure. It is generally supposed that copies of Magna Carta were despatched by royal command to all the shires, there to be read publicly in county courts and afterwards placed for safe keeping in a cathedral or abbey. The grounds for this view are three, which may be considered in turn.

(1) *The inherent probability of such a course*: "there might have been doubt as to its validity", says Mr. Collins, "had it not been proclaimed locally throughout the realm."² Expediency might suggest to the barons the need for giving wide publicity to the Charter; but there is no evidence that its legal validity could have been impugned if it were not proclaimed in the shires.

(2) *The practice in 1215 followed well-established precedents*: In a classic essay,³ R. L. Poole compared the circumstances of Magna Carta of 1215 with those of earlier and later "great charters". The important factual contents of that essay have perhaps obscured the frequent recourse to conjecture where problems connected with promulgation crop up. Poole examined only two charters earlier than Magna Carta: the coronation charter of Henry I (1100) and the second charter of Stephen (1136). He did not notice the brief and comparatively unimportant charters of liberties given at coronation by Stephen (1135) and Henry II (1154). This is not surprising, for no clue to the method of their promulgation seems to exist; but this very absence of evidence affects the general picture. Roger Wendover, speaking of Henry I's charter, declared that "as many charters were made as there are counties in England, and by the king's command they were deposited in the abbeys of

¹ Cf. J. H. Round, *The commune of London* (1899), p. 88.

² Loc. cit. p. 243.

³ "The publication of great charters by the English kings", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxviii (1913), reprinted in his *Studies in Chronology and History* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 308-18.

every county as a memorial". Now Roger wrote more than a century later, and no contemporary of Henry I records this action. In support of the chronicler, however, Liebermann and Poole pointed to numerous copies addressed variously to bishops and sheriffs in different parts of the country.¹ This proves that many copies circulated but not that the king or his chancery took the initiative in sending out copies; and the textual variants militate against a simultaneous promulgation in all directions. We have only Roger Wendover's word that the king ordered this distribution. Poole went on to discuss the second charter of Stephen, of which three survive from the cathedral muniments of Exeter, Hereford, and Salisbury.² On this he observed: "Though the charter *was certainly sent out* to three cathedral churches and *was no doubt published in every county*, its provisions did not become well known."³ But there is no proof that the surviving copies were "sent out" rather than procured by the initiative of the bishops or other magnates of the localities concerned; and there is no evidence whatsoever that the charter was 'published in every county'.

(3) *The contemporary evidence of 1215 points to a general distribution of Magna Carta.* By this time the chancery was highly organized and, as we may see from the Close Rolls, was accustomed to send administrative orders to all parts of the country simultaneously. It was not impossible for the king to send out copies of Magna Carta from chancery by his messengers, if this seemed to him necessary or desirable. But was this done? Poole answered, yes. He quoted Ralph of Coggeshall, who says that the peace-terms were put into a charter "so that each county of all England should have its charter of the same tenor confirmed by the king's seal". The Dunstable

¹ "The publication of great charters by the English kings", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxviii (1913), reprinted in his *Studies in Chronology and History* (Oxford, 1934), p. 309.

² They have no address and all begin alike. They show minor variants in the text, witness-list, and dating. Besides these so-called "originals", contemporary copies are found in *Historia novella* of William of Malmesbury and Richard of Hexham's *De gestis R. Stephani*.

³ *Ibid.* p. 312 (italics are mine); cf. p. 311: Poole says, "there are also signs of the charter having been accessible at Canterbury and Malmesbury".

annalist says that "charters were made and deposited in a safe place in each bishopric"; while "Walter of Coventry" suggests that "a copy was carried round towns and villages and everyone swore to observe it". Now Coggeshall's words certainly imply, as Poole thinks, that the charter was officially despatched throughout the country, though they could be otherwise interpreted. The Dunstable annalist throws no light on the method of delivery. Walter of Coventry's account conforms to the terms of the draft writ to sheriffs of 19 June (and might indeed be derived from it); this speaks of "our charter which we have ordered to be publicly read throughout your bailiwick and firmly maintained". The obvious implication is that royal officers bore the charter from place to place and exacted the oath for its maintenance. So Poole wrote: "The charter was not merely circulated; it was proclaimed."¹

But Poole's further discussion of the writ is curiously ambiguous. "The procedure with regard to preceding charters suggests² that what was sent to the sheriff was an original of the charter itself. But on no previous occasion was it commanded that the charter should be publicly proclaimed in the county court or in any other court.³ We have difficulty in believing that so long and technical a document as Magna Carta could have been actually read aloud in Latin in the county courts; and when we follow the text of the document which orders this reading, we may infer that its essential purpose was to enjoin obedience to the twenty-five guardians of the Charter and to provide for the election of persons to inquire into and to abolish the evil customs practised by the royal officers." Poole seems to suggest that the Charter was sent with the writ to each sheriff, but that formal proclamation did not involve a public reading of its text.

Regarding the evidence of the writ it must be noted that it is a draft, written upon the dorse of the patent roll, addressed

¹ "The publication of great charters by the English kings", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxviii (1913), reprinted in his *Studies in Chronology and History* (Oxford, 1934), p. 314.

² We have seen how valueless this argument is.

³ The writ is only known from the patent roll, and in the twelfth century there were no enrolments.

" vicecomiti ",¹ etc., without specifying a shire. In other words, we rely on inference from the terms of the writ in supposing that writ and charter went out at royal command to all shires. This, however, is reckoning without the memorandum which follows the writ on the dorse of the patent roll,² a memorandum which Mr. Richardson analysed and discussed in a different context.³ One interesting feature of this memorandum has been remarked above (p. 327): that writs apparently went out in advance of any copy of the charter and that the charter is not mentioned before 24 June. But there is another point of interest. Most of these copies of the writ (each clearly earmarked to be the authorization for the particular sheriff and officials named in the copy) were not handed to royal messengers for delivery. One of John's soldier-sheriffs, Engelard de Cygoiny receives a copy, and Henry de Ver, a confidential clerk of the king, is provided with a writ or writs for twelve counties, ranging from Kent to Cornwall and Cumberland. But apart from these men and two bishops (of Worcester and Lincoln) the recipients of writs are persons associated with the baronial party. They include two of its leaders, the earl of Winchester and Eustace de Vescy, a lesser man, Philip fitzJohn, who later appears as a rebel, and (most conspicuously), Master Elias of Dereham, Archbishop Stephen Langton's famous steward. Not only did Master Elias receive the writs for the Cinque Ports and eleven counties: he also received ten of the thirteen copies of the charter which are mentioned in this memorandum. The remaining three were taken by the bishops.

The machinery of distribution is not made perfectly clear by this memorandum, but its main significance is unescapable. The chancery did not, of its own initiative, distribute writs and charters to all the shires of England. The Crown was in no hurry to see them delivered. Either the chancery did not accept any obligation to distribute these documents or

¹ The words "in eodem comitatu", later in the address, forbid us to extend *vic'* to *vicecomitibus*.

² Poole unaccountably failed to mention it. It is discussed by Collins, loc. cit. pp. 275-6, who gives a facsimile, pl. 14. Cf. above.

³ "The morrow of the Great Charter", *ante*, xxviii (1944), 426-8.

else it proceeded so slowly with the task that the baronial party stepped in and organized a partial distribution itself. The writ was an administrative order and the responsibility for delivering it, once authorized, to the sheriffs should surely have rested with the chancery.¹ But Magna Carta itself may have been treated like any other grant to subjects of the king : if the beneficiaries wanted copies they must get them and pay for them. Likewise as regards enrolment : it has often been remarked that neither Magna Carta of 1215 nor any of its three reissues was enrolled by chancery. The reason would seem to be that nobody wanted to pay the fees.² This was not a document which chancery felt constrained either to copy or to enrol on its own initiative. Nothing in the evidence which has been reviewed seems to suggest the contrary.

¹ Cf. the writ of 27 June to the sheriff and twelve elected knights of Warwickshire. "Idem mandatum est omnibus vicecomitibus Anglie" (*Rot. lit. pat.* p. 145b).

² Cf. *Memorandum Roll I John* (Pipe Roll Soc., n. s. 21, 1943), p. xlviij, where Mr. H. G. Richardson, arguing along different lines, connects the absence of enrolment with the matter of fees.

FRANCIS LIEBER: TRANSMITTER OF EUROPEAN IDEAS TO AMERICA¹

By FRANK FREIDEL, A.M., PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

DURING the 1880s and 90s, most American historians, following closely in the pattern of their great contemporaries in England and Germany, occupied themselves largely with the study of their own governmental institutions, which they traced to their European origins. Unfortunately, they paid more attention to the Anglo-Saxon or Roman background of the institutions than to the impact of American environment. As a result, they were vulnerable when a young professor at the University of Wisconsin, Frederick Jackson Turner, eloquently pleaded that they should also examine the influence of the frontier upon American history.

Turner's frontier thesis wrought a revolution in American historical writing. Turner himself, who had been educated in the earlier school of institutional development, had no intention of ignoring the enormous contribution of Europe to the United States. It was some of his followers who became so pre-occupied with the frontier that they forgot to look back across the ocean to their European heritage. To them the frontier, not even the American seaboard or its cities, let alone the old world, was the great fountainhead of American ideas and institutions.

Such an exaggerated view could not long endure, since it was as unrealistic by itself as what it had preceded. Consequently, more recent historians in the United States have again looked to Europe. They have studied the way in which its institutions made the transit of the Atlantic, and underwent modification on American soil to meet the needs of the new world.

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 9th of November 1955. This paper is based on Frank Freidel, *Francis Lieber: Nineteenth Century Liberal* (Louisiana State University Press, 1947).

Historians of the American colonies have been especially vigorous in their analysis of the impact of European ideas upon the transatlantic frontier, but others have carried their studies up through the nineteenth century into recent decades. In different ages, the process has varied widely, until indeed at present it has become to some extent a two-way transit with some introduction of American ideas and institutions back into Europe.

The actual mechanics of this transport of European concepts to America is fascinating to examine in detail. Sometimes the seed sprouted at once and bore fruit in the new world indistinguishable from that in the old. Sometimes it fell on barren soil and failed to grow at all, or was planted prematurely, and developed only years later. Most often, it did grow, but changed perceptibly to fit the American climate. The outcome was seldom twice the same.

In the middle of the nineteenth century, from the age of Jackson to that of Grant, no one was more active in bringing this seed to America and planting it, than Francis Lieber. In his career in the United States between 1827 and 1872, one can examine concretely how this process functioned. Lieber has become a relatively forgotten man even though some of the concepts that he brought to the United States are now commonplace in that country. This makes him none-the-less interesting, for like many another of those dimly seen in the background of the stage of history, he participated in some memorable scenes. A brief identification of him would seem dull: he was born in Berlin in 1798, came to England in 1826 and the following year migrated to the United States. For many years he was a Professor of History and Political Economy, first at South Carolina College, and later at Columbia College—now Columbia University. He wrote many books, none of which is read today. This might well be the summing up of the career of many an industrious nineteenth century scholar. But scrutinized more closely, it was almost as romantic and adventurous as that of Trelawny, and he had almost as remarkable a knack for being where important events were going on as one would find in the hero of an historical novel.

One of Lieber's earliest memories was of Napoleon's troops parading triumphantly into Berlin in 1806. A few years later, a lad of only seventeen, he served as a footsoldier in the Waterloo campaign—himself witnessing the battle unscathed only to be wounded a day or two later at Namur. He kept a diary at the time, and a decade later wrote a gripping account of the campaign as it appeared to a private in the ranks.

After the war, he was one of those excited, nationalistic youths in Germany who engaged in gymnastic exercises with *Turnwater* Friedrich L. Jahn, and agitated for German constitutionalism and unification. He came strongly under the influence of the philosophy of Fichte, less so of Hegel, and of the theology of Schleiermacher. This meant an emphasis upon the worth of the individual, and upon his rights and duties toward the community—an intermixture of individualism and nationalism.

Although Lieber was closely associated with Jahn and the *Turners*, he was not yet in a university, and technically at least not a member of the *Bursenschaften*. But he was a friend of a member of that organization, Karl Sand, who in 1819 assassinated a reactionary playwright. In the aftermath of the assassination, when the government disbanded the student groups, Lieber was arrested and imprisoned. After his release, he went from university to university, harried by the Prussian police. For a while, he studied at Jena where the faculty, in order to give him protection, bestowed a doctor's degree in mathematics upon him only four months after his matriculation. It was an unusual way to begin his studies ; what followed was equally unconventional. In 1821, he made his way with a group of romantic adventurers to Greece, to participate in the Greek war for independence.

Lieber found the Greeks a half-wild, lawless people rather than the noble Hellenes he had envisioned. After months of mishaps, he left, thoroughly disillusioned, for Rome. There the Prussian minister, Barthold Georg Niebuhr, rescued him, hired him to tutor his son, and in turn provided Lieber with a splendid education. Niebuhr, the first of the great modern German historians, impressed upon Lieber his institutional method of

studying the Roman Republic. More than this, he impressed upon Lieber the significance of what the young man had witnessed in anarchic Greece. "His ideal was orderly development by process of law," and his model, Great Britain, Lieber once wrote. During the period of French domination over Germany, Niebuhr had published a study of Great Britain "to show what liberty in reality is"—constitutional liberty within the bounds of law. He thoroughly grounded Lieber in the writings of Edmund Burke, and infected Lieber with a distrust of the French Revolution.

Thanks to Niebuhr's intervention, Lieber was able for a time to return to Berlin, where he established himself in the highest intellectual circles, associating with young Leopold von Ranke, the historian, Alexander von Humboldt, the geographer, and with lawyers, musicians, and literary figures. But the police again harried him and imprisoned him, although he had thoroughly shed his earlier revolutionary ideas. He would not inform upon his former companions. Some months after his second release from prison, he came to the conclusion that there was no future for him in Prussia. In May, 1826, he fled to England.

Here, armed with a remarkable portfolio of letters of introduction, he proved again his uncanny knack for being at the right place at the most dramatic time. On Sunday, 4 June 1826 he called upon his idol, Karl Maria von Weber. The tubercular composer, exhausted from the task of completing and conducting his opera "Oberon", received his visitor while lying weak in his bed. The very next day, Weber died.

During a year's sojourn in England, Lieber became acquainted with the dynamic group of intellectuals who were planning the University of London. Lieber hoped to become one of the professors. He thus met the banker, George Grote, already gathering material for a great history of Greece; Henry Brougham, a prominent Whig advocate, later to be one of the authors of the Reform Act of 1832; and twenty-two-year-old John Stuart Mill, destined to be one of the greatest *laissez-faire* philosophers. In addition, he studied the Lancastrian monitorial schools, at that time at the height of their popularity in

England, and through this interest became acquainted with Mrs. Sarah Austin, the beautiful and clever wife of John Austin, who developed the famous Austinian theory of jurisprudence. From Lancastrianism, Lieber's discussions with Mrs. Austin turned to utilitarianism in general, and soon she introduced him to the aging Jeremy Bentham. Lieber agreed heartily with Bentham's aim to "maximize" human happiness. But Lieber, whether through difficulties with the English language, or a too thorough grounding in German political principles, stayed out of the utilitarian orbit.

Nevertheless, through the Benthamites, Lieber found employment in America. He met one of the American exponents of utilitarianism, who was interested in gymnasiums. Was it not necessary to develop a healthy body as a fit housing for an enlightened mind? And who was better qualified to administer physical training than Lieber, who had been one of the favourite disciples of *Turnvater Jahn*? So Lieber was commended to a group of Bostonians who the year before had founded a gymnasium. They aspired to obtain Jahn himself, but failing that, they took Lieber.

They obtained a young man who brought with him not only the skill to operate a gymnasium and found the first swimming school in the United States, but was overflowing with European ideas and schemes of every sort. His breadth of interests and knowledge was truly remarkable, and the self-assurance with which he sought to introduce these into America was even more startling.

Lieber had the good fortune to arrive at Boston in 1827 when it had reached a high level of prosperity as a commercial and textile centre. Its leading citizens were aspiring to make it the Athens of America, and having just recently discovered German scholarship, were ready to make much of Lieber with his fine letters of recommendation from Germany and England.

Lieber's classes in gymnastics and swimming were not much of a success. Few parents were willing to spend money to teach their children to swim, even though one morning, the President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, went swimming there. As for the gymnasium, American children

were too individualistic to tolerate calisthenics in unison. They felt no joy or power in them, unlike young men in Germany. Lieber himself was individualistic enough to sympathize with his pupil's boredom, and was ready to recommend instead a programme of sports which would fit the age and physique of various groups of boys and girls. The difficulty was that while the gymnasium to be popular with the students had to offer recreation, to be popular with the parents who paid the bills, it had to offer tangible proof of its economic worth. Consequently, even as Lieber tried to modify it, physical education would not take root in the United States at this time. In later decades, calisthenics were forced upon unwilling children ; it was only in the twentieth century that the country accepted what Lieber had recommended : a system of physical education including sports, swimming, hygiene, and sex education.

Even before it became clear that the gymnasium would fail, Lieber was embarked upon another and infinitely more successful project. This was the editing of the first encyclopedia in the United States, the *Encyclopaedia Americana*. Although English encyclopedias were being sold in the United States there was none which was truly American. At first Lieber conceived of his project as being no more than to bring another European encyclopedia to the new world. He proposed translating the excellent German work by Brockhaus, the twelve-volume *Conversations-Lexikon*, and obtaining a large sum from the leading American publishing house, Carey, Lea & Carey, began work. Almost at once he realised that translation alone would not suffice. He enlisted the aid of numerous American intellectual leaders to prepare articles for him, the most notable being Justice Joseph Story of the United States Supreme Court to write the legal articles. So that while the smaller articles came via translation, or even more directly by scissors and pastepot, from other publications, the longer ones were original, often meritorious, and gave to the *Americana* distinction as a broad and elaborate contemporary appraisal of the United States in the Jacksonian period.

Moreover, the articles on science, religion, and government, despite minor inaccuracies, well presented the advance of

knowledge to the 1830s. They brought European ideas to America in a cheap and popular form at exactly the time when Americans were eager for knowledge. Thousands of Americans were ready to buy an encyclopedia as a means of self-improvement. The era was one when the common man was struggling for hegemony, and he was sure his greatest weapon in the battle was education. Not only did he fight for free schools for his children, but he sought knowledge for himself, and an encyclopedia was a favourite device for self-education. The encyclopedia, which was first published between 1829 and 1833, went through countless editions and remained the standard American encyclopedia up to the time of the Civil War.

Sets of the *Americana* were to be found everywhere, from the British Museum to the Canton quays. Almost every well-to-do American home possessed one. When Lieber called on President Jackson he found the latest volume on a White House table. Many of the sets passed into young hands which one day would be influential. Charles Eliot Norton, Harvard's great professor of aesthetics, as a child browsed through it so repeatedly that twenty years later he could still recite the volume titles, "A-Bat, Bat-Cat, Cat-Cha," and so on. By the 1850s, the encyclopedia was even among the scanty store of books of a rather obscure Illinois lawyer-politician, Abraham Lincoln.

With the *Americana*, Lieber had perhaps his greatest success in bringing European culture to the United States, and at the same time stimulating in Americans a knowledge and pride in their own civilization. In some other projects, which he pursued partly in order to earn a living, and partly out of his own enormous intellectual energy, he repeatedly failed. These failures too are interesting, because most often they occurred because Lieber was ahead of his time. Or perhaps, it can better be put that the United States was still intellectually a rather raw new place, dependent upon Europe in many respects, and not yet capable of supporting all manifestations of culture from across the Atlantic.

Lieber's basic problem was that an intellectual like him, cursed with a heavy Germanic writing style, could earn a living only with difficulty. There were no universities in the European sense ; the colleges were mostly of a strongly theological bent.

The number of desirable chairs in them was very limited. Nor were there the opportunities for a government subsidy that existed on the continent.

Consequently, Lieber for a time proposed one project after another. He planned a number of journals, none of which materialized. They would have been of a profundity and degree of specialization not feasible until, by the end of the nineteenth century, America possessed sufficient scholars to support them. For example, Lieber outlined one to cover geographical, statistical, and ethnographical subjects; another was to be an "archive" of the best American writings and source materials on history, politics, and jurisprudence. To find readers for such magazines would have been difficult. Even to have been a contributor could have made one suspect in some circles. When Lieber asked John Pickering, conservative Boston lawyer and ardent amateur philologist to endorse one of these magazines, Pickering replied, "you ask about using my name, . . . — & you know my old objections. There can be no doubt, that in this country of businessmen the pursuit of *literature* is injurious to a professional man."

When he planned a more practical periodical, Lieber came closer to success, but even this scheme was stillborn. He actually persuaded a Boston publishing firm to send out a printed prospectus for an American Catalogue, similar to one published in Germany, containing the authors and titles of all works published in the United States and Canada during the previous year. Even here, Lieber was a full thirty years too early.

Lieber ran into fresh difficulties of other varieties when he tried to promote several educational schemes. When in 1830 a group of New York notables sent out a call for a literary convention to discuss plans for the proposed University of the City of New York, Lieber was among the fifty-two heads of colleges, professors, scientists, and men of distinction who received invitations. Several of the scholars denounced in scathing terms almost every one of the established landmarks of the American collegiate system. Lieber enthusiastically supported them from his fund of knowledge about European universities, suggesting that the new American institution adapt the best

characteristics of those in Europe, and avoid their weaknesses. He did not wish it, like German universities, to make the professors dependent upon student fees for their salaries. Some of the most significant fields would draw relatively few students, and professors seeking large recompense would try to be popular rather than profound. On the other hand, he wished to see the university, like those in Europe, place its first emphasis upon the faculties of science and letters. This plea for a liberal arts university won much approval for Lieber, but when the New York University was founded shortly thereafter, a group of Dutch Reformed ministers dominated it. They turned it into a typical classico-theological college noteworthy primarily for religious conservatism and faculty wrangling.

All that had been gained was for Lieber to grow in prestige. As a result, when the Directors of the Girard Trust in Philadelphia wished plans for a training school for orphans, they turned to him. Lieber enthusiastically prepared a plan of education in keeping with the spectacular five-million-dollar bequest of Stephen Girard. He wished it to be the means of "carrying over some of the fruits of long and toilsome experience in Europe . . . and planting them [in] the fresh and rich soil of this new world". Consequently, he liberally interpreted the will to embrace no mere orphan school but a comprehensive polytechnic and teacher-training institution. It would offer a wide range of courses and encompass shops, laboratories, an observatory, and a press. He proposed the discussion technique for teaching some courses, and wished to bar corporal punishment on the upper levels. His plans obviously owed much to his earlier association with Mrs. Austin, and his familiarity with the writings of Cousin, Pestalozzi, and other European educational reformers. The plans were comprehensive and reasoned; in many respects they envisaged a school of the sort to be found in the twentieth century.

The plans aroused the enthusiasm of a few American intellectuals, and of the Utilitarians in England. Mrs. Austin reported that Lord Brougham approved of them, and that Lady Byron, who had started a school near London, was trying some of Lieber's suggestions. But they made no impress upon

the practical Philadelphia politicians who were to control the Girard legacy. Even when sponsored by native-born Americans, German and English educational ideas were slow to win acceptance among the nationalistic American public, which saw a taint in anything that they were conscious was being introduced from abroad. Had Lieber been another Horace Mann, his task would have been difficult ; labouring under the handicaps of a thick accent and a turgid writing style, he found it impossible.

When Lieber proposed a further book on educational theory, his practical-minded friend Jared Sparks, later President of Harvard College, pointed out that this would be of undoubted value but problematical success. He warned Lieber that he must think not in terms of Europe with its cheap labour, but of the United States, "where the young men crowd in throngs into active life, and fill up spheres in which intellectual attainment or culture is not necessary to success". Sparks inquired rhetorically, "When do you think the time will come, that the University of Berlin, with its brilliant array of professors, would flourish in Philadelphia ? Not till the forests shall all be felled to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, and 'every rood of ground maintains its man'."

Lieber could not afford to wait for a more populous America to bring a suitable living his way. Rather he scrambled around for odds and ends to keep his family fed. One of the enterprises in which he probably earned little money but did gain prominence, was the cause of prison reform in Pennsylvania. There, interestingly enough, he was writing on an American theme, and ultimately did much to spread American ideas on prison reform in Europe.

His interest in prison reform grew out of his editing of the *Encyclopaedia Americana*, and his acquaintance with two young French aristocrats, Alexis de Tocqueville and Gustave de Beaumont, who had come to America in part to study its prisons. Tocqueville became famous later for his classic *Democracy in America*, but he and Beaumont did shortly after their visit publish a book on American prisons. Lieber in translating the book added voluminous introductory remarks and notes which encompassed the whole field of penology. In fact, the word

"penology" itself was of his subsequent coinage. Some of what he wrote was not palatable to Tocqueville and Beaumont but did gain for him a wide hearing. Unfortunately he was in part defending what today would be considered barbarous—a system of solitary confinement in which no prisoner was allowed at any point to communicate with any other prisoner. He was so able in his arguments that when Charles Dickens launched a sentimental attack upon one of the Pennsylvania penitentiaries in his *American Notes*, the reformers turned to Lieber to refute the libel. Ultimately some of Lieber's writings on such subjects as the iniquity of public executions appeared in German, and helped to bring about reforms in his native land.

But these were minor matters compared with Lieber's thinking about the fundamental institutions of government. He had long been interested in these, but could not write upon them systematically while he was scrambling for a precarious living. Fortunately, it became possible for him to develop his ideas after 1835 when he obtained a chair at South Carolina College. It was not a location he enjoyed, in a small Southern provincial town, and during the next twenty-one years he chafed and squirmed in it, bombarding his northern friends with pleas to find him some other position. Nevertheless, this was where he wrote his major books and made his most significant contributions to his adopted country.

Lieber was not the first foreigner to bring European methods into American college classrooms, but he was the first and the most influential in the social sciences. It was a field scarcely developed in the United States when Lieber began teaching, and much of the techniques which later became commonplace were new and exciting. What little was taught in the area was usually on the basis of assigning chapters from a dull textbook and forcing the students to recite them back endlessly and uncritically.

To the distress of his colleagues and some college trustees, Lieber regarded texts only as a stimulus, not as the mainstay of his courses. He liked best to disagree with them; moreover, he subordinated the conventional assignment-recitation method to the lecture technique. He assembled his lectures from a wide range of information and delivered them freely from notes.

Frequently he broke his abstruse theoretical discussions with interesting, even sensational, anecdotes and illustrations. These might conceivably be from the local newspapers or from Homer, and upon current cotton prices at Liverpool or the courtship habits of South Sea Islanders. Often he would read to his history classes, perhaps from Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* or, after its publication in the early 1840s, from Macaulay's "exquisite" *Lays of Ancient Rome*.

Altogether, Lieber introduced his students to a broad range of the social sciences. In 1835, for example, he lectured to second year students on the science of history and the development of Greece, and to the fourth year students on political economy. He lectured to the third year men on current events. In this course, he used newspapers as his texts. He himself had attended similar "newspaper lectures" at Halle, "in which history was caught alive". In subsequent years he widened his courses to include almost the whole of the social sciences. He gathered large quantities of materials on political theory, fused them in the crucible of the class, then poured them into his books.

Historians of American political theory have labelled Lieber an eclectic. Here, as elsewhere, he was a gatherer of European seeds for American planting. Obviously much of his political ideology came from the rich German harvest of his youth. In subsequent years he gathered more—not from Germany but from the England of his maturity. Some of the political ideas died in the strange soil of the new world; others flourished, and with subsequent mutations came to appear indigenous and distinctly American.

Lieber was pleased when critics identified the first of his major works, *The Manual of Political Ethics*, as essentially an American work, yet he recognized his debt to his mentors. "No German I know could have analyzed public life as I have done, having had the advantage of a practical citizen's life for many years, in a vast republic," he emphasized. "No American probably could have written other parts without first entering deeply and laboriously into continental knowledge."

Here, then, was Lieber's rôle, to interpret the political phenomena of the new world in the ideological terms of the

old—to explain, identify, and label. It was all old, yet at the same time new, since Lieber could harvest only what would take root in American soil. To trace the origins of his ideas would necessitate unraveling a snarl of interwoven sources; Professor Charles Robson has ably outlined the most important of these. There can be no doubt, for example, that there was much of Burke in Lieber's writings. But it is problematic how much came directly through reading Burke, how much through Niebuhr, Schleiermacher, and the German milieu, and how much through Lieber's American conservative friends Story and Chancellor James Kent. It is significant that Lieber dedicated his *Political Ethics* to the Englishman, Henry Hallam, and the American, Joseph Story.

In the constitutional era in the United States, Lieber believed, the citizen enjoyed new rights and perplexing responsibilities. These Lieber took as his particular field of investigation. Much as he revered Kent's and Story's applications of the common law to the new age, and deeply as he admired the Hamiltonian interpretation of federalism, he felt the positive law was inadequate as a guide to the new order. The relationship of the citizen to the state went beyond the cold formality of the law, since law without popular support was a dead letter.

Primarily Lieber wished to lay down sound precepts to guide the citizen in his many activities beyond the province of positive law. To do so required two stout volumes: the first setting forth an ethical and political system; the second developing out of the system maxims to cover every possible responsibility from the conjugal relationship to the chief magistracy of the Federal Union.

Lieber consciously constructed his political philosophy by selecting what he considered to be the best parts of previous systems, and in developing his eclectic system he manifested a strong dualism. His approach to political theory was that of a German moralist awake to American practicalities. He based his system upon both historical and philosophical foundations, envisaging man's life as revolving around the twin poles of individuality and sociality. The individual's relationship to society was reciprocally one of rights and duties; and the most advanced form of government under which he could live

was one of checks and balances, of federal dualism. Lieber's writings even seemed to idealize the middle class, combining as it did the industry of the masses and the solid economic foundation of the aristocracy.

Embedded in this massive piece of writing were thousands of details which made it a serious intellectual task to read and analyze, but out of it emerged in total the first institutional interpretation of American culture. It profoundly influenced the course of American social science—not only political theory, through men like John Burgess, but also sociology, through William Graham Sumner, and economic theory, through Thorstein Veblen.

Even more influential than the *Political Ethics* was Lieber's subsequent *On Civil Liberty and Self Government*, which grew in part out of his increasing discomfort living in the antebellum South with its strident defence of slavery, and his observations from the United States of the governments of Great Britain and France. At the time of the Revolution of 1848, he hurried to Frankfurt to participate in the Parliament there, but found himself a stranger in his native land. He found the right and centre too conservative for him, and the young men on the left, toward which the confused assembly was drifting, too radical. They were trying to adopt untried Gallic methods rather than the well tested English or American ones. Lieber feared it made no great difference, that Anglo-American laws would not work in Germany since "they presuppose a people well skilled, trained, and formed in the politics of liberty".

As he predicted, the Frankfurt assembly failed. Also to his disgust, the conservative bourgeois government of Louis-Philippe in France had given way after 1848 to that of Louis Napoleon. Lieber wrote an article sharply contrasting English and French liberty. Scornfully he wrote of the concentration of power which characterized the French. Their liberty rested in government, not the people, and they sought to develop organizations, not individualism. While the British followed patterns of orderly evolution, the French drifted into eddies of stagnant institutionalism. All this came about because the French confused what Lieber called democratic absolutism with genuine civil liberty.

This was the theme of Lieber's treatise on *Civil Liberty*. Students might visit Continental Europe to study art, music, or science, he declared, but to learn liberty they would have to come to America or England. These two nations alone truly understood the concept. "There is an immense difference," he pointed out, "between admiring liberty as a philosophical speculation, loving her like an imaginary beauty by sonnet and madrigal, and uniting with her in real wedlock for better and for worse. Liberty is the loved wife and honoured companion, through this earthly life, of every true American and Englishman."

How had Great Britain and the United States achieved this felicitous state? How had it come about, even though, in the United States especially, the franchise had become very broad? This it was important to answer, since historically the unchecked masses had aided the princes against the barons, and in modern times through universal suffrage they might vote all power to a dictator. "Uninstitutional universal suffrage," Lieber warned would "turn the whole popular power and national sovereignty . . . into an executive, and thus fearfully . . . confound sovereignty with absolute power, absolutism with liberty."

"Yet the idea of all government implies power, while that of liberty implies checks and protection. It is necessary harmony between these two requisites of all public vitality and civil progress which constitutes the difficulty of establishing and maintaining liberty."

The only solution—and here Lieber came to the crux of his theory—was "a well-grounded and ramified system of institutions, checking and modifying one another, strong and self-ruling, with a power limited by the very principle of self-government within each, yet all united and working toward one common end". Their "number supports the whole, as the many pillars support the rotunda of our capitol". These the United States and Great Britain possessed in abundance, and these gave vitality to their constitutions.

Institutions to foster civil liberty were those which, applied to political man, protected him against "undue interference, whether this be from individuals, from masses, or from government". The greater part of the *Civil Liberty* was a study of

these institutional checks ; in most of them Lieber saw only unalloyed good. For example, he lavished praise upon the common law, not in the least doubting its capacity to keep apace of rapid economic changes, for it was all "the time expanding and improving". As for judicial review, not even the notorious Dred Scott decision on slavery was to alter his praise for that "very jewel of Anglican liberty, one of the best fruits of our political civilization".

What Lieber was doing in all this, of course, was to bring European theoretical concepts to justify what he considered good and just and vital in the American and English systems of government. What he was undertaking became even more clear at the time of the outbreak of the Civil War.

By this time, Lieber had finally succeeded in moving North to Columbia College in New York City. Aligning himself firmly with the North against the right of the Southern states to secede, he enunciated strongly again the nationalistic doctrine running through his *Civil Liberty and Self Government*. In addition to marshalling all the legal arguments against secession, he fell back upon his institutional theory. Institutions more than just a constitution made the United States a single, indivisible nation. Even before the Constitutional Convention it had been a nation. One people settled the thirteen colonies. They brought with them a single language, common customs and institutions, professed allegiance to one crown, and considered themselves to be a distinct and separate people. The existence and divinely prescribed mission of the United States as a nation far transcended all narrow legalistic interpretations of the Constitution. "The normal type of modern government is the National Polity," Lieber declared. "The highest type . . . is the organic union of national and local self-government." Only upon this basis could the American nation fulfil its destiny.

Professor Emory Washburn of Harvard Law School appraised the true value of what Lieber was saying when he commented : "Not only ought men to be right in their feelings but in their convictions and to that end they ought to *know why* the opinions they respect are sound and tenable. And when you, and men like you, put into their hands in a plain and intelligible

form the true theory upon which this seemingly complicated system of government rests you do a substantial and lasting benefit to the whole republic."

In other words, men in the North knew how they felt ; they were ready to fight to keep the South from leaving the Union. It was useful for them to have handed to them an explanation why they should feel that way.

During the Civil War, Lieber came to ponder less on questions concerning the relationship of the individual to the nation, and more on those revolving around the relationships among nations. Concrete thinking about the problems of the international law of war started him upon this. The Attorney-General and the General-in-Chief of the Union Army consulted him upon various points. Soon he conceived the idea of codifying the laws of war, and ultimately sold his project to the government.

The result was army General Orders 100, " Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field," issued in May, 1863. It was the first code of the international law of war actually to be put into operation. Like so much of Lieber's earlier work it grew out of American experience, in this instance in the conduct of the war, which led Lieber to lay down precepts and generalizations. These he buttressed with learned reference to the European authorities on international law.

General Orders 100 was not binding during the Civil War, but served as a statement of general principles for the guidance of commanders in the field. It was more humanitarian than treatises on the laws of war written in earlier epochs, and may have had some effect in mitigating the harshness of the conduct of the war.

Hostilities had scarcely come to a close before General Orders 100 began to acquire authority and the extreme veneration of United States army officers and experts on international law. It inspired Johann K. Bluntschli, a German political theorist, to prepare a similar treatise which was in large part little more than a translation. Soon it was the basis for a code of the laws of war drawn up by a congress of scholars, and this in turn led to the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907. The Hague

regulations, still in effect, according to Elihu Root "gave the adherence of the whole civilized world in substance and effect to those international rules which President Lincoln made binding upon the American armies". Thus what Lieber imported from Europe to apply to the American conflict came to be exported back to Europe in modified form.

During the last years of his life, after the Civil War, Lieber worked energetically to try to extend codification to the entire field of international law, through congresses of experts. He sought also to promote arbitration as a means of solving international disputes. In all this, interestingly, he worked not only to try to impress the State Department, which listened respectfully, but also the leading specialists on international law in Europe. Private international conferences of the sort he recommended were held in the 1870s, but he did not live to attend them. They were the direct forerunners of the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, and subsequent international organizations.

By the time Lieber died in 1872, he had traversed a complete circuit in his functioning. His limited, but significant, contributions were no longer in bringing European ideas to America but in sending American ideas to Europe. In part this was a gauge of the rapid growth and richening of American culture in the years since he had first presided over a gymnasium and swimming school in Boston. What had been such a one-way traffic was beginning to become an interchange.

As for Lieber himself, he had made a valuable contribution to his adopted country. The theories he had introduced, the words and technical terms with which he had enriched the language, remained part of the warp and woof of American culture. Though he was not, as he had supposed, a great and original thinker, Lieber had transported to the new world a rich cargo of alien concepts. Strange and difficult at first, these ideas lost their exotic flavour and became by the time of his death an integral part of the American tradition. More significant than Lieber himself, these concepts remained common coin while their innovator's name disappeared. As a conveyor and synthesizer even if not as an originator, Lieber was great.

THE REVEREND ARTHUR YOUNG, 1769-1827 :
TRAVELLER IN RUSSIA AND FARMER IN
THE CRIMEA

By JOHN G. GAZLEY, PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AT DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, NEW HAMPSHIRE

I

EVERY textbook of English or European history makes some reference to the great Arthur Young, 1741-1820, in connection either with the Agricultural Revolution, or with his *Travels in France* on the eve of the French Revolution.¹ His son, the Reverend Arthur Young, the object of this study, is not at all famous and was not at all great. There is no notice of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. As a clergyman he never held a living except in Ireland, from which he was an absentee. As an agriculturalist he was but a pallid shadow of his father. The only reason why he is worth a study is that in 1805 he went to Russia at the invitation of the Imperial Government to make an agricultural survey of the province around Moscow. He remained in Russia until 1814, was there again from 1815 to 1820, and finally for a few months before his death in 1827. In 1810 he bought an estate in the southern Crimea near Kaffa (Theodosia).

Considerable information about the Rev. Arthur Young is to be found in the Young Manuscripts in the British Museum.² Quite recently the John Rylands Library at Manchester has acquired fourteen letters by the Rev. Arthur Young, as a part of the Bagshawe Muniments.³ Most of these letters were written from Russia to his father, mother, and wife. Some are very lengthy. They will furnish the chief source for this study.

¹ J. G. Gazley, "Arthur Young, Agriculturalist and Traveller, 1741-1820", BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, xxxvii (1955), 393-428.

² Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 35,126-33.

³ John Rylands Library, Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/2-15.

They throw light not only upon Young himself but upon Russian conditions in the period, 1805-27.

The third child and only son of Arthur Young and his wife, Martha Allen Young, was born in 1769. Little is known of his youth but he was probably neglected by his father, who was away from home much of the time, and probably spoiled by his doting and very badly balanced mother. His first serious education was at Bury St. Edmunds Grammar School. In 1784 at the age of fifteen he was given his first training as an agricultural observer when he was taken by his father on a fortnight's trip through Essex and Kent with two nights in Calais.¹ In 1785 he went to Eton where he spent four years. By this time his parents had decided on a career in the church for their son and were counting upon the influence of the boy's uncle, Dr. John Young, Fellow at Eton and chaplain to George III, to secure fat livings and rapid advancement. Unfortunately Dr. Young was killed in a hunting accident during Arthur's first year at Eton. Arthur Young wrote in his *Autobiography*, "It was a dreadful blow . . . to all my son's hopes . . .".² Had Dr. Young lived, the Rev. Arthur Young would probably have had a very comfortable, if not distinguished, career in the church. Now he would have to make his own way, with whatever influence his father might be able to exert in his behalf.

From 1789 to 1793 Arthur was at Trinity College, Cambridge. He seems to have done well enough there and in his third year received the "first prize of the year for English declamation".³ Nevertheless he failed to make the brilliant record at Trinity which would have given him a fellowship. Just before he entered Cambridge his father had written Arthur a very moving letter in which he had been urged in the strongest terms to waste

¹ The trip is described in A. Young, *Annals of Agriculture*, ii (1784), 33-104.

² *Autobiography of Arthur Young*, p. 139. Further information about his years at Eton will be found in R. A. Austen-Leigh, *The Eton College Register, 1753-1790*.

³ *Bury and Norwich Post*, 29 February 1792, p. 3. In 1938 I called upon the late D. A. Winstanley who very kindly examined the records of Trinity College, including the "Conclusion Book". There was no disciplinary action taken against Young who was a good enough student to become a "scholar" in 1792.

no time but through his utmost efforts to persevere in attaining the highest honours. The father wrote :

. . . there is no branch of useful science that has not conducted men to fortune provided there is excellence & superiority ; but moderation & a common degree, does nothing. . . . Use four y^{rs} to come well, and with an intrepid perseverance and you will be made for life. . . . There are so few young men y^t have the courage to do it y^t those who are steady are sure of the prize. . . .¹

In 1793 Arthur received his degree from Cambridge and shortly afterwards was ordained. Nine years later he finally secured an Irish living through the patronage of the third Earl of Egremont. His father had long been intimate with the earl, who was the leading figure in Sussex agriculture and a loyal member of the Board of Agriculture. By 1797 the Rev. Arthur Young was writing articles for his father's *Annals of Agriculture*, nearly every one of which contained the most fulsome praise of the earl. One extreme example must suffice :

That active encouragement which animates the noble Lord to whatever is conducive to the improvement of mankind, is become the theme in every circle. . . . His residence at Petworth is the levee of whatever is either intimately or remotely connected with the cause of the plough. . . . A character of this complexion is above all praise, superior to all merit. . . . The father of the county, the protector of the plough, the noble Lord has acquired a celebrity as durable as it is distinguished ; and whilst the guardian angel of our island speeds the British plough, and patrons like his Lordship direct it, we may laugh at the impotent fury of our foes. . . .²

Whether the noble earl was motivated more by his friendship for the Secretary of the Board of Agriculture, or by the flattery of the latter's reverend son, is uncertain. At any rate the Rev. Arthur Young obtained through the earl's aid a large living in Ireland, the Union of Agassin, consisting of six parishes in County Clare and in the diocese of Killaloe, and covering an area of 42,000 acres. His purely mercenary interest in his living is all too evident in a letter to his father written while he was engaged in the formalities necessary to take possession :

As I have not finished reading the assent & consent & the whole service of the church, which it is necessary should be gone thro' in each parish on a Sunday,

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,126, fols. 478-9.

² *Annals of Agriculture*, xxviii (1797), 204-6. For his other articles see ibid. 255-7 and xxix (1797), 78-89, 109-24, 271-7, 306-7.

(reading both morning & evening service in each of them) I shall not be able to leave this part of Ireland before the end of the present month ; after that I shall return to England as fast as I possibly can. . . .¹

There is no evidence that he ever returned to Ireland, although he held the living throughout his life. He complained that the previous incumbent had only received £780 annually, but he hoped to do much better. In the same letter he warned his father not to paint things in too bright colours to Lord Egremont :

But Let me beg of you not to magnify but to diminish the value (or rather to speak the truth) if ever you have any conversation with Lord Egremont about it—because, as his Lordship has in fact promisd me another & a more valuable union adjoining mine, & tenable with it, if he find this that I now have can ever hereafter be raisd, he may possibly think it sufficient without the other. . . .²

Whether he obtained the second living is unknown, but certainly he was disappointed with the amount of tithes which he was able to collect. From 1808 to 1810 a protégé of Arthur Young in Ireland made vain efforts to increase the income from the tithes by farming out their collection for a fixed sum.³ After the Rev. Arthur Young had gone to Russia his father repeatedly approached Lord Egremont with the idea of securing an English living for him. Egremont was not unwilling but pointed out that the acceptance of an English living would necessitate residence in England and hence the sale of the Crimean estate. Egremont wrote to the great agriculturalist that his son " seemed to me very much to prefer the thoughts of farming in the Crimea to preaching in England ".⁴ Even the father admitted : " In one respect Agassin is *peculiarly* advantageous that of . . . being a sinecure ".⁵ There is no evidence that the Rev. Arthur Young was ever a religious man except in a purely formal sense, even though he served as curate at Bradfield for two years before he

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,128, fol. 501.

² Ibid. fol. 500. Further details about his living are found in ibid. fols. 490-1, 506-7.

³ Ibid. 35,130, fols. 130-1, 264-5, 305, 397-8. The Rev. William Gooch went to Ireland in 1808 to act as estate agent for Lord Templeton at Castle Upton. The appointment had been made upon Young's recommendation.

⁴ Ibid. 35,133, fol. 440. The date is 26 August 1819.

⁵ Ibid. 35,132, fol. 430. This letter is not dated, but has been attributed, probably correctly, to 1815.

went to Russia.¹ His letters which have survived are purely secular in tone.

A major explanation for the tragedy of the Rev. Arthur Young from a purely professional point of view, is to be found in the fact that he never quite made up his mind whether he wanted to concentrate upon the church or upon agriculture. His father must bear a considerable portion of the blame. Even in that letter which he had written to his son upon entering Cambridge he weakened his exhortation to concentrate everything upon success in a clerical career by the following :

I wish to God you would pick up a knowledge of agriculture, by y^e time I die the world will find out that they might have made a better use of my knowledge & make me offers when too late for me to take y^m, but it may afford opportunities for a Son if he has nothing better, y^t may be of importance. . . .²

After such advice it is not surprising that the first work which the Rev. Arthur Young undertook after his ordination was an agricultural survey of Sussex for the newly established Board of Agriculture. It is difficult to believe that he would have received such an assignment had he not been the son of the Secretary. He took the work seriously enough, and spent more than two months in the county, from 5 August to 15 October. The survey, which was meant to be brief, appeared before the end of 1793 and was one of the first of the county surveys to be printed. The account which he wrote of his trip for the *Annals of Agriculture* filled nearly 300 pages.³ It seems thorough and competent and is as well written as most of his father's purely agricultural tours. It contains many statistics and farming accounts of profits and losses so typical of his father's work. He could not forbear from exhibiting his classical training by including excerpts in Latin and Greek from the classical authors on agricultural subjects. It was during this tour that he first became intimate with Lord Egremont. He also met another of his father's old friends, Lord Sheffield, who wrote of him : "He was very much approved here & was thought very like you in voice & other particulars." In the same letter Lord Sheffield expressed a warning which

¹ This information comes from the Parish Register at Bradfield Combust.

² Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,126, fol. 479.

³ *Annals of Agriculture*, xxii (1794), 171-334, 494-631.

both father and son might well have heeded: "I am not yet quite reconciled to your putting him in this line if you mean to push him in the Church—I revolted against it from the beginning, & I find others think as I do."¹

Mention has already been made of the several articles on Sussex agriculture which the Rev. Arthur Young contributed to the *Annals of Agriculture* in 1797. Four years later in 1801 he was still devoting himself to agricultural pursuits. On 28 May the Committee on Papers for the Board of Agriculture voted £50 to him "for the abridgement which he made of the Returns sent to the Committee of the House of Commons of the quantity of corn &c grown in Parishes where Enclosures have been made . . .".² Two weeks later he was awarded £60 for the third best essay in answer to an enquiry by the Board as to the best means by which arable lands might be converted to pasture and then back again to arable without damage to the soil.³ Since 340 essays were submitted for this contest, to win third prize was quite an honour, although some cynics may have pointed out that his father was Secretary of the Board which made the awards. It should also be noted that the Rev. Arthur Young hired a farm from his father at Bradfield which he held until he went to Russia.⁴

For an understanding of the Rev. Arthur Young's character an analysis of his relations with four members of his family is necessary—his father and mother, his sister Mary, and his wife. He had had three sisters. Bessy, just a year older than he, had died of tuberculosis in 1794 at the age of twenty-six. Martha or "Bobbin" had succumbed to the same disease at the age of fourteen in 1797. There had probably been a time when Arthur resented his father's obvious partiality for Bobbin, but this is purely surmise. Mary Young was three years older than Arthur. She never married and outlived him. She seems to have been devoted to her brother, and she was the member of the family

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,127, fol. 289.

² London, Library of the Royal Agricultural Society, Minute Books, no. 5, fol. 226.

³ Ibid. fol. 239. Young's essay was printed in *Communications to the Board of Agriculture*, iii. 99-172.

⁴ *Autobiography*, p. 406, where it is stated that Arthur's farm had been re-let.

who held it together. Relations between the great Arthur Young and his wife Martha were notoriously bad.¹ Friction must have been constant and could hardly have failed to affect the children. It seems almost certain that Arthur was his mother's favourite and Bobbin was without doubt her father's.

Relations between the father and son were never really cordial. The father expected too much of his son who probably suffered from an inferiority complex which manifested itself in aggressiveness and extreme impatience. When Arthur Young was making his famous trips to France in the late 1780s, he constantly complained to Mary, to whom nearly all his letters were written, that Arthur seldom wrote to him. One example will suffice :

I have not had a L^r from him of 11 months ; I suppose because I expressly desired one once a fortnight : But nothing surprizes me that come fr^o him ; Eton has I hope has [sic] done so much for his head that it leaves nothing for his heart—God send it may prove so ; & y^t I have not impoverished myself for nothing. . . . Say nothing to Arth : ab^t writing ; I had much rather have no L^{rs} than such : as those hints bring : . . .²

A letter from Mrs. Young to her husband in 1809 also reveals some of the reasons for Arthur's difficulties :

. . . his education was so uncommonly expensive (& that, *I know to my heart* was with the best intentions) that it formed perhaps too strong notions of independence . . . & I see plainly a splendid life caught him with the compliments he had been paid on yr account & in some lesser degree I think it may be on his unremitting attentions . . . on his own. . . .³

After Bobbin's tragic death in 1797 her father experienced a religious conversion which influenced his entire life and outlook. He became an extreme Evangelical. The fact that his son, although a clergyman, shared none of these views prevented any real community of thought between father and son.

In 1798 the Rev. Arthur Young was guilty of an indiscretion which was most embarrassing to his father and which exhibited all too clearly his own moral obtuseness. On 1 May he wrote a letter to Gamaliel Lloyd, a Radical of Bury St. Edmunds, in

¹ Gazley, op. cit. pp. 403-5.

² This letter is reproduced in facsimile in *Autobiography*, opp. p. 188. The date is 27 July 1789.

³ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35.130, fol. 276. The date is 14 July.

which he boasted of his attempt to tamper with the views of some of the prospective jurymen for the impending state trial of Arthur O'Connor :

I dined yesterday with three of the jurymen . . . who have been summoned to Maidstone to the trial of O'Connor and Co. . . . as they are good farmers and much in my interest, to be sure I exerted all my eloquence to convince them how absolutely necessary it is . . . for the security of the realm, that the felons should swing. . . . These, with many other arguments, I pressed, with a view that they should go into court avowedly determined in their verdict, no matter what the evidence. . . .¹

Believing the story to be true, Lloyd passed the letter along and eventually it reached the defence counsel who read it to the court. Although Young was summoned to appear in court, apparently he never did so. To exonerate himself from what he claimed to be only a joke, he secured affidavits from most of the jurymen that he had never talked with them about the trial. His father thought it necessary to write a letter to the press, explaining that it was only a hoax but admitting that his son's conduct was inexcusable. In his *Autobiography* the father was almost brutally frank : "To avoid being punished as a rascal, he must prove himself the greatest fool in Christendom."² It must be kept in mind that the Rev. Arthur Young was nearly thirty years old when he was guilty of this escapade. Putting the best possible interpretation on the incident, it reveals a deplorable lack of judgement.

In July 1799, the Rev. Arthur Young was married to Miss Jane Berry who had been a friend of Bobbin at the London school which Bobbin had attended. After Bobbin's death she had visited the Youngs and thus Arthur had met her.³ Tradition

¹ T. B. Howell, *A Complete Collection of State Trials*, xxvi. 1224-5.

² *Autobiography*, p. 318. Young's letter to the press is to be found in the *Bury and Norwich Post*, 30 May 1798, p. 2. References to the affair by friends are to be found in Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,128, fols. 31, 33.

³ Since Jane was an illegitimate daughter of Edward Berry, Esq., she was known at the time of her marriage as his niece, Jane Griffiths, and was thus described in the notice in the *Bury and Norwich Post*, 10 July 1799, p. 2. Dr. F. Taylor, Keeper of Manuscripts in The John Rylands Library, has very kindly searched certain later family letters in the Bagshawe Muniments, not included in the printed Handlist, and has established clear proof of Jane's illegitimate birth. There also existed a mysterious connection between Jane Young and the sixth Earl of Coventry who presented Jane's portrait to her mother-in-law, sent

has it that Jane Young was very beautiful,¹ although by 1814 she weighed over 200 pounds.² She was clever but not an intellectual, sensitive and impressionable, quite sentimental and somewhat affected. With her sister-in-law, Mary, her relations seem to have been excellent. She apparently got along well with her mother-in-law until her return to England from Russia in 1810 without her husband. Mrs. Young had always been partial to Arthur and apparently regarded Jane's return without him as desertion. She even went so far as to accuse Jane of indiscretion with Young's secretary, William de St. Croix. The bitterness of the relationship is clearly shown in two letters which Jane wrote to her father-in-law in May 1811 :

When I think of you I wish I had wings to fly to you, but when the remembrance of Mrs. Y. presents itself before [me] I shrink with horror at the idea of being again within the sound and reach of her tongue—I feel a most decided *aversion* against her, . . . I have suffered too much from her behaviour to me, ever to forget it. . . .³

her a handsome hair ring so expensive that she protested at it, and left her in his will an annuity of £200 and a lump sum of £500. The reference to the portrait is in a letter from Mary Young to her father, 6 September 1809, Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,130, fol. 295. That to the hair ring is in a letter from Jane Young to her mother-in-law, 16 August 1806, Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6, fol. 8. Lord Coventry's will was very kindly copied for me by Miss Vera J. Ledger, Somerset House, London, P. C. C. Loveday, fol. 762. It contains three codicils. The first, dated 21 May 1802, provided for the annuity which Lord Coventry was careful to specify should be "absolutely independent of her said husband and without being subject to his Debts incumbrances and Control". A second codicil dated 25 December 1806 provided for the lump sum to Jane with a similar clause about her husband. A third codicil dated 22 February 1804 made a bequest of £200 to Mary Young. On the death of her father in 1818, Jane received further very substantial bequests, the annual interest upon a capital sum of £800 and part of his residuary estate which her father-in-law estimated would bring her from £3,000 to £5,000. New York Public Library, Berg Collection, Burney Papers, letter from Arthur Young to Marianne Francis, 17 December 1818. In a letter which Arthur Young wrote shortly afterwards to Charlotte Barrett, ibid. 23 December 1818, he stated that Jane's father had so arranged his bequests that "the receipt [was] tied neck & heels for payment into her own hands". I wish to acknowledge my great indebtedness to the Curator of the Berg Collection, Dr. John D. Gordan, for permission to make use of the Burney Papers and to quote from them.

¹ I was given this information by Mrs. Rose Willson, niece to the last Mrs. Arthur Young, whom I interviewed in 1931.

² N.Y. Public Library, Berg Collection, Burney Papers, A. Young to Marianne Francis, 1 October 1814.

³ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,131, fol. 87.

Her behaviour to poor St. Croix was even more painful to my feelings than all her abuse of me . . . as his conduct was always that of a gentleman, and I will ever stand up as his friend and advocate. . . . I would trust St. Croix with any secret, for I have a *very high* opinion of *his* prudence & discretion, and much does he need it. . . .¹

Jane Young was as completely devoted to her father-in-law as he was to her. Indeed she came to love him better than any other person in the world, with the possible exception of her sister. In her letters she usually addressed him as "my dearest & most beloved Friend", and in one wrote: "I feel my heart softened and animated when addressing you, by every tie of affection and sympathizing tenderness that a human being can experience towards another."² As early as 1803 Jane experienced a religious conversion which made her an Evangelical like her father-in-law. From that time she was his constant companion at numerous religious services and later helped him with his schools and charity to the poor. After her return to England in 1810 she made her home with her husband's family, at least until Arthur Young's death in 1820.

At first the Rev. Arthur Young's marriage seems to have been reasonably happy. He probably loved Jane as much as his essentially selfish and self-centred nature permitted. There were no children and as early as 1802 Arthur Young confided to his *Autobiography*: "My son has no children, nor likely to have any."³ Probably Jane never wanted to go to Russia and she suffered much from ill health in that country. She did not accompany her husband when he went to the Crimea to purchase an estate. His six letters to her before her return to England in 1810 will indicate something of their relations at that time.⁴ On her return journey to England Jane was accompanied by a Mr. Rowand who was a British merchant or consul in Russia and for whom she came to feel something approaching a romantic sentiment, as indicated in a letter to her father-in-law, describing Rowand's visit to her at her father's home:

Rowand arrived here on Wednesday Evening; my Father is much pleased with him. . . . I feel much pleased in this opportunity of introducing Rowand to

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35, 131, fols. 88-9.

² Ibid. fol. 166.

³ *Autobiography*, p. 382.

⁴ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/9-14.

my Father & Sister, and of his becoming acquainted with every part of my Family. He has done so much for me that I feel it a real obligation to try all in my power to convince him of the *wish* at least that I have, of being grateful.¹

Twice after her return to England she complained to her father-in-law of not receiving any letters from her husband :

Have you had any intelligence from Arthur? . . . It is very strange he will not take the trouble to write. . . . I am afraid Arth. is too much taken up with his farming concerns to remember his friends in England. . . .²

Have you heard from Arth.? . . . Surely Arthur might have written by Odessa but it always was with him, "out of sight out of mind". . . .³

The Rev. Arthur Young returned to England in the spring of 1814 and remained there until late in 1815. There is no indication that Jane was waiting for him at London on his arrival. Indeed she seems to have permitted four months to elapse after her husband's return before she joined him at Bradfield. Two very guarded comments by Arthur Young in letters to Marianne Francis⁴ in the summer of 1814 before Jane's arrival at Bradfield indicate that things were not right :

. . . and of the rest I yet know nothing, and I have little heart to make enquiries ; the frame of my Sons mind, after 9 years absence from every religious ordinance, is not calculated to make any amends : he is fixed here for the summer, and further about him and his wife I know nothing. . . .⁵

I have nothing to add to what I said before relative to arrangements here : I make myself as easy as I can, but that is a string I do not desire to touch, there is no harmony in it. . . .⁶

In the summer of 1815 when the Rev. Arthur Young went to London to prepare for his sailing, Jane remained at Bradfield. Nor was there any mention of the possibility that she might return to Russia with him. All in all, one gains the impression that by 1814-15 their marriage had become a mere formality and that their interests had become completely divergent.

The last letter by the Rev. Arthur Young in the Bagshawe Muniments is a very personal one to Jane and shows that their marriage was ended by a legal separation, almost certainly obtained on her initiative. The heading of the letter is tantalizing : "Donegall arms, $\frac{1}{2}$ past 3—Friday 27th—". No month,

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,131, fol. 96. ² Ibid. fol. 158. ³ Ibid. fol. 169.

⁴ For further material on Marianne Francis, the young Evangelical bluestocking who was a niece of Fanny Burney, see Gazley, op. cit. pp. 419-22.

⁵ N.Y. Public Library, Berg Collection, Burney Papers, 4 July 1814.

⁶ Ibid. 2 August 1814.

no year, no place ! It has been attributed, probably by some member of the family, to the year 1823.¹ The body of the letter is concerned with relatively unimportant and uninteresting details of the financial settlement, but the very long postscript cannot be omitted, although it might well be interpreted in several mutually contradictory ways :

I hope we shall come together again, & live hereafter happily in each others society. God knows what may happen. I part from you, as the Almighty knows, with the deepest sorrow in my soul : tho' you have treated me harshly & cruelly, yet I love you still. I feel for you with the tenderest compassion & I hope & trust that we may be soon re-united, not only in heaven but here on Earth. Oh ! my dearest Jane, Let us not give up this hope altogether, but encourage rather than stifle the impression. Your new friends will freeze your soul to sympathies of this sort, because you are comparatively wealthy to any of them, & the chance of losing such a booty would necessarily stimulate them to prejudice your mind against me.

One thing, I trust you will never refuse. I may become a pious & a religious man. Your example may make so strong an impression on me, as to awaken me to a sense of my danger. . . . You may be the means of saving at last my soul from Hell. There is no possible chance in this life, that any other human being whatever can ever have such a chance of exerting this influence as yourself. When I feel this influence coming on, I shall apply to you, my Love, for strength & assistance. I hope therefore that we shall occasionally see each other. If you still continue to distrust me, till the deeds are signed, & refuse an Interview till then ; at least gratify me, when that is finished—without which I will never subscribe my hand to the deed. It would be to subscribe to my own execution, to launch me into Hell ! . . . The terms of our separation are now agreed upon. Throughout every part of this transaction . . . I have conducted myself with a caution, a *prudence* and forbearance, which perhaps few in my case would ever have confined myself to. It is not very likely that you should long remain concealed in this town without my soon discovering the place of your retreat. In fact the agents I employed discovered you on Thursday & the egress & regress of Rosetta in the streets soon furnished means to come at this. When I tell you in plain language where you are, you may believe me. No 16—is I presume the place.

I will not leave you to judge whether I have acted with honour, with tenderness, with regard & affection for your peace of mind. I come here with the power of the Court of Kings Bench in England in my pocket to take you to Bradfield : So far from exerting this authority, I offer you the terms you rejected

¹ The year 1823 appears in pencil at the top of the manuscript. It seems a good guess, for Jane Young would hardly have made the break with her husband complete before her father-in-law's death in 1820. Furthermore, it seems probable that the Rev. Arthur Young was in England in 1823. My own guess is that the letter was written in an Irish, Scotch, or Manx town because of the reference to the Court of King's Bench "in England".

last year by which I lose one years annuity or £300. . . . If this be as you say it is hard & unreasonable, I trust I may be always governed by such principles. . . . I long to see you. I do most ardently desire an Interview but I would strike off my right hand before I would now violate the sanctity of your retreat or offer the slightest violence to obtain my request without your permission.

Farewell. ever your affectionate husband—¹

The chances are that the separation was permanent. It is certain that the Rev. Arthur Young in the last years of his life was the father of two illegitimate sons, one of whom was born in 1826, and that their mother was "Agatha Sturgeon, servant".² There is no other evidence that he was promiscuous. Probably after the separation from Jane he decided to form an irregular connection in the hope of providing himself an heir. Nevertheless, the birth of illegitimate children to a clergyman must have created quite a scandal, all the more so when it is remembered that less than a decade before Bradfield Hall had been a leading Evangelical centre for all West Suffolk.

II

In 1789 the great Arthur Young had predicted that some outstanding agricultural opportunity might come to him when he had become too old to accept it, and he had urged his son to be prepared for such a contingency. His prediction came true in December 1804, when he was invited by the Russian government to make agricultural surveys of some of their provinces on the model of the county surveys of the Board of Agriculture. Had the offer come even ten years earlier he would probably have accepted with eagerness and the historian might have had a description of Russia in the early nineteenth century comparable

¹ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/15.

² The Parish Register at Bradfield Combust lists as baptisms "Arthur John, son of Agatha Sturgeon" and "Arthur Young, son of Agatha Sturgeon". A window near the door of the church is dedicated to the second, "deceased 15th September 1855". Another memorial in the church is to "Arthur John Young, born July 12th 1826, died Jan. 29th, 1896". This latter was the last Arthur Young to be squire at Bradfield, after whose death the property was sold and the manuscript letters given to the British Museum. Twice Arthur Young, in letters to Marianne Francis, refers to "Bet Sturgeon", once as a reader to him, and once as a servant to Jane. Whether this was the same person as Agatha is unknown. Perhaps they were sisters. N.Y. Public Library, Berg Collection, Burney Papers, 13 August 1817, 11 April 1818.

to Young's classic on France on the eve of the Revolution. But Young was sixty-three years old and he hesitated. Shortly after the offer was made he returned to Bradfield for Christmas and of course told his family about the offer. The project apparently made an immediate appeal to the Rev. Arthur Young and so his name was presented to the Russians and, after some delay, accepted. He was to go to Russia early in 1805 and survey one of the central "Governments". All his expenses were to be paid by the Russian government and in addition he was to receive £1,000 per year. Jane Young was to accompany him as an interpreter, presumably because she had a command of French.¹ From a letter of James Smirnove, the Chaplain at the Russian Embassy in London and an old friend of Young's, it seems certain that the Rev. Arthur Young had raised the possibility of obtaining an estate in the Crimea after he had surveyed several Governments.²

In January 1805, there was a hitch in the negotiations. The Rev. Arthur Young became very impatient over the delay and wrote a rather nasty letter to his father who was doing his best to secure a satisfactory settlement.

Bradfield Hall. Thursd. 31st

Dear Sir

What thorough-paced insolence this Russian bear has shewn to you thro' the whole of this transaction : & I am astonishd that you can bear such studied delay, which after all will now most clearly end in a cold answer. Nor can I possibly imagine, what on earth could induce you to renew a negotiation, which had ended in a bargain so remarkably to my advantage—which had been explicitly settled in the presence of witnesses (or one at least). This letter of yours has given the finest opening that could possibly have been required, to overthrow the whole business, by affording the man such grounds for his excuses ! which never would [have] happend otherwise.

The bargain was clenched [sic] & done with—& tho' the journey might never have taken place, all the odium would then have rested with Novozitzoff. because he must have meanly & dastardlike flown from a bargain in the presence of a witness, which cannot be the case now since you have re-opened the negotiations.

I hope my Mother has not been interfering underhandedly by writing any secret letters.

¹ *Autobiography*, pp. 402-6.

² Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,129, fols. 194-5. This letter, dated 12 January 1805, also details the terms of the contract. Smirnove had probably been a pupil of Arthur Young twenty years earlier. His letters were always couched in the friendliest terms and he visited Bradfield as a guest.

To the above Jane Young added a long postscript as typical of her as the ill-natured letter was of her husband.

My Dearest & best beloved Friend

Arthur is, as you see, quite angry about the Russian scheme being delayed, or what is most likely totally set aside—Novositzoff's behaviour is certainly most ungentleman like if not to say shameful, for an answer one way or the other is the least he could do—how do you know but what *Smirnove* may be at the bottom of this business—by *all means* get it decided *one* way or the other, but don't continue in indecision & uncertainty, for it is of all things the most unpleasant . . . tell him *Ar's* business is at a stand & on account of *preparations* & *setting off so soon* things must be finally arranged one way or the other. These Russians are certainly very mean people & I am sure staying away is better than going, but as Arthur wishes to go, do everything in your power & let it be above all settled, for it worries & vexes him sadly. . . . Adieu in great haste believe me ever most affectionately

Your faithful

Jane Young¹

At last everything was settled and they set sail from Harwich on 18 April. They had probably bought for the journey across northern Europe a special post-chaise "in which they may have bedding and sleep at full length".² They disembarked at some North Sea port whence they went overland. They stayed at Berlin for about a week where they were entertained by the English and Russian ambassadors, left Berlin on 14 May and were at Königsburg on 25 May, from which town the Rev. Arthur Young wrote the first letter in the Bagshawe Muniments.³ All in all, the country was dull and uninteresting, the inns and food poor, the trip very fatiguing.

The whole Country is without the least exception far very far away the most uninteresting, flat, sandy, barren District, I ever saw. . . . In travelling, we

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,129, fols. 261-2. The project for the survey seems to have been brought to England by Count Nicholas Novosiltsov when he came on his famous mission which resulted in the Anglo-Russian alliance of 1805. The Rev. Arthur Young's mother seems to have been addicted to writing secret letters, and this was only one of her many peculiarities.

² *Autobiography*, p. 406.

³ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/2. This is the first of this important collection of letters, upon which the remainder of this article is chiefly based. Number 1 in the manuscript consists of the leaves from Arthur Young's autobiography which have been substantially reproduced in Gazley, op. cit. pp. 416-19. How these letters from the Rev. Arthur Young came to be in the Bagshawe Muniments is explained in the BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, xxxv (1952-3), 281-2.

started generally at 5 & journeyed until 9 at night allowing $\frac{1}{2}$ an hour for our breakfast, & eating our dinner generally in the Carriage as it went on, yet we seldom gained more than 40 to 45 miles in 16 hours. Under such circumstances to write Letters is almost an impossibility—We have no time to eat or to drink, & as to sleep—4 or 5 hours is all the time we can spare for it, for when we get to the end of the days Journey, something must be had for supper, & when I write in my Journal, it is generally 12 at night before I am in bed, & as to Jane, if Jane was to set down to write Letters when she came in to any town in the Evening, the fatigue would be so great that she would be dead by so doing—All she can do is to go to bed.

At the end of Arthur's letter to his father Jane added a pathetic little postscript :

I can only just tell you in two lines that I love you more than ever & can never cease regretting this horrid separation—Oh ! how I long to see Dear Bradfield again, be assured I shall love it more than I ever did. I will write the very first opportunity but I am dead with fatigue & want of rest—How is Mrs Y—pray say every thing that is affectionate from me to her & Mary—I can write to nobody, we are just setting off for Memel a dreadful journey. . . .

The Rev. Arthur Young and his wife arrived at St. Petersburg about the middle of June and on the 21st of that month he wrote a long letter to his father, giving his first impressions of the Russian capital.¹ Unfortunately they met Prince Novosiltsov at one of the last posting stops, bound for France, so he was not there to smooth their way. When this letter was written, the details of their plans and of the financial arrangements were not yet settled. A considerable portion of the letter is worth quoting :

The expence of living in this town is prodigious—All expences are upon an average as dear again as in London. The character of the Russians you are totally unacquainted with. They are very fond of new projects, but they soon tire, and if a bargain be not made & *clench'd*, nothing can be done It is hardly possible to imagine any set of people so shuffling & so crafty as these in all transactions with foreigners—All their undertakings, & projects, & improvem^{ts} . . . are the work of foreigners, yet they are cajoled & cheated & ruined. . . . There is not a single Englishman that I have seen here (& I dined at our ambassador's in company with 80 or 90) who do not invariably declare, that without specified agreement, I could never expect to come at a shilling. The truth is, that the Russians . . . detest all foreigners, especially our countrymen who live in a most respectable manner, & spend a deal of money, caring for the Russian no

¹ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/3. I have tried, perhaps unwisely, to keep the Rev. Arthur Young's confusing punctuation, the worst feature of which was his habit of using a period instead of a comma in the middle of a sentence.

more than the Russian cares for him. & besides, the Character of a merchant they affect to despise. & as the English have not the art to insinuate themselves into their good graces, it is frequently seen that a french barber or hairdresser or Valet, metamorphosed into a Tutor, rules the family, & directs the education, & sleeps with the mistress of many a Russian House of the first distinction. French, Germans, Swedes, Foreigners of all descriptions incorporate themselves with the natives—but never the Englishman. . . .

Petersburg is an astonishing city, for regularity of building—width, length, & the straitness of the streets, the size depth & number of the Canals all fac'd with granite & parapets of granite, the amazing size of all private houses, & their regular fronts, & the number & prodigious size of all the public edifices, all built with brick, stuccoed over, & beyond all, the front which faces the Neva, forming a Quay several miles in length, & covered with palaces & private houses without number. the river as wide as the Thames at London bridge, but the bridges over it are only boats with planks over. . . . But if we look to social comfort in this town, we look in vain. Every one looks upon his neighbour as an enemy, that is not connected by family marriages, the town is very badly paved, & no footwalk except on the Quays & Canals. the entrance to the great houses is thro a gateway precisely the counterpart to an English inn, at the back part in a large yard fill'd with wood & ashes & dirt. There are no water works which let the water into the houses by pipes, or sewers to take off the filth and return it to the river. . . . Lodging & boarding at Hotels is abominably bad & scandalously dear. . . .

The carriages of this place are so extremely dear that it is impossible to use them in the neighbourhood. . . . We have been to the parties of several of the Russian nobility. . . . Any quantity of wheat might be had at this & other places in Russia if English merchants in England would only order it—laid into London Storehouses, at 6 or 7^t. a Bushel. . . . Stockings are manufact^d here by Englishmen Cannon are cast by English—Ships built by English—Gardens laid out by English. Deserts converted into cultivation by English. English architects—English Physicians & Surgeons. Their coin is stampd by English. Leather made by English, Cotton goods by English—yet we are detested. In Forty other branches have English been employd—but they kick them out & cheat them whenever they have suckd them, & set Russians in their place. . . .

It was probably after the receipt of the above letter that Arthur Young wrote in his diary: “I wish cordially they were well home again, and so do they, I believe.”¹

Two more letters from the Rev. Arthur Young to his father in the Bagshawe Muniments date from the early years of his stay in Russia. They are not dated, nor is any place given. They were probably written in 1806, but might have been written late in 1805 or even in 1807. The first is of considerable interest on several points—the suspicion with which the nobles regarded

¹ *Autobiography*, p. 418.

him, the considerable social mobility which existed in Russia, the difficulties with his interpreter, and the universal prevalence of bribery.¹

Dear Sir. I have great reason to believe that the jealousy and illwill which has been shown to me, & the aversion to giving me information, and the general coldness, of all classes of the nobility has arisen from the fear of my being sent here to examine into the conditions of their peasants, with a view of their being ultimately emancipated. The subject is of the tenderest & most delicate nature to these men. it cannot nor ever was mentioned by me, without my decisive disapprobation. . . . But to you I tell, that without security to them, in some way or other, from the oppression which they too often experience, no improvmt. can or ever will take place. . . .

The Government eagerly wish some improvemt.; but of all persons in the Empire, His Imp^l. Majesty wishes it most. Already the *crown* peasants can buy Land & slaves. . . .² they can hire land upon lease: make contracts & bargains: they can at any time enroll themselves, as burghers or merchants, . . . The Government is straining its attention to commerce as much as it possibly can. But it appears to me, that all their attention to trade is likely to be at the expence of agricultural improvement: & because, the wider the door is opened to the peasant to become a trader and settle in a town, the more numerous will be the crowd, but especially if riches and honours are attached to it, for, as now, every peasant who can do it, leaves the plow for the city, upon the prospect of rising by trade, & thousands succeed: thus husbandry suffers. It is true, that freedom is gained, & in the very best manner; being at no expence to their masters, but the result of their own Industry. and I am perfectly sure, from conversing with many peast^s upon the subject, that it is the idea of all, that by going to a town for a number of years (if private peast^s) they will in a course of time become sufficiently rich to tempt their masters to sell them their Liberty. . . . They will be sure to make fortunes. certainly not altogether by honest means, being bred otherwise. But they have no notions of freedom, with any explanation attachd to it but in order to gain riches by trade. Peasants and land . . . in their new Capacity of burgess or merch^t, of any degree, they are not permitted to buy. it would interfere it is thought, with their attention to business. . . . With regard to my Interpreter, He has been my greatest Enemy: . . . Nothing can possibly be done with him, he is incorrigible; an idle lazy vagabond rascal; & such a dreadful liar I never met with before; this fellow is so habituated to lies, that he never speaks truth. . . . The new General Governor, Tootalmeen, tho', with my Interpreter I have been 6 or 7 times upon business to him, has never once asked me to sit down in his company: he never addressed himself once to me, he has never condescended to give me an answer upon my asking him only for one of the Gov^t. Land measures for a few days to draw a map or two. . . . This General Governor is very unlike the last. He does no business;

¹ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/4.

² This statement is in accord with the ukase of 24 December 1801, according to which land could be acquired by merchants and crown peasants. See A. Kornilov, *Modern Russian History*, i. 87 ff. and G. T. Robinson, *Rural Russia under the Old Regime*, p. 63.

I believe him to be perfectly incapable of anything but giving balls & receiving bribes—This brings to notice, that in this country (rotten 'ere ripe) the grand touchstone is money. By this, you become Senator or soldier, nobleman or merchant : the courts of justice are bribed by the parties as regularly as the suit comes before them. . . . No man can get justice without being rich. the poor never yet had it—the country peasant bribes the district forest master to allow him to lay waste the crown forests. he bribes the head officer of the land police to concur in the same plan. this land policy master is the superior officer of the crown peasants for the district. His lawful salary is 250 R a year, about £30—he spends several thousands. If the Izprovnick wants a purse, he drives to the constable of a Crown Hundred (volost) makes a speech, that the roads 50 versts¹ off are in want of repair, or he adds, if necessary, that certain abuses in such a village have come to his notice, & that they are likely next week to be brought before the tribunal in which he sits as President. or he will give a hint, that a fresh levy of recruits will soon take place, when he will have the means of selecting such & such, & shewing favour to this or that. . . .

That the Rev. Arthur Young was probably correct in his explanation of the hostility towards him is borne out by an entry in her journal for 4 January 1806, by Miss Martha Wilmot, a young English girl who was visiting in Moscow as the guest and protégé of the famous Princess Dashkov. The entry is even more interesting as being almost the only frank contemporary reaction to him :

. . . Mr Young, the son of Mr Young the great Agriculturalist, who came over to make observations on the productions, culture and capabilities of the Russian soil, on the State of the Peasants &c. &c. call'd here this Eve^g & was very badly rec'd by the P.[rincess] who is incensed at the *nature* of his employment which she thinks tends to overturn the Government & excite discontent in the people. In this idea she is join'd by almost all the noblesse, so that Mr Young finds himself involved in the unpopularity of his profession to a degree that is often highly embarrassing & disagreeable. I cannot say I am very much pleased with his manners as there is neither dignity nor elegance in them, but he stay'd a very short time. . . .²

The other letter which the Rev. Arthur Young wrote to his father about this time is very long, very technical, and of no great general interest.³ It was chiefly concerned with a project for

¹ The *verst* was roughly two-thirds of a mile. Young's Izprovnick should be Ispravnik.

² *The Russian Journals of Martha and Catherine Wilmot*, p. 264. In a letter to her sister, dated 18 February 1806, Catherine Wilmot stated that Alexander I was very unpopular among the Russian nobles because he had brought Young out to Russia for the survey. *Ibid.* p. 215.

³ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/5.

settling some town dwelling peasants upon the land. A few excerpts merit quotation :

. . . I was yesterday at the police office to inquire into the number of people in this town ; the whole according to a census made most accurately this month, is 242,000, and some few odd—Would you believe it, out of this number are 84,000 domestic servants, and 30,000 passport crown peasants—Whilst at various times Petersburg has laboured under a severe scarcity of corn, from its remote distance from supplies ; in the interior of the European part, the corn rots in the stack-yards of Her own peasants, as being too cheap to induce them to carry it to market. When a tchevert¹ of rye is 8 R at Pet^g, it is not more than a 5th. & sometimes not so much in Saratof and Tambof, all connected by water with Pet^g. But then this communicⁿ. is slow and distant, requiring from the breaking up to the setting in of the ice to go from these remote quarters to the capital by water : & frequently, dry summers and little water absolutely stop no inconsiderable part of the supplies. From the beginning of the navigation of 1806, there passed down the Ladoga Canal into the river Neva 3982 barks, 1644 half barks, 747 of another sort, and 3709 boats loaded with . . . rye meal : . . . wheat meal— . . . oats : . . . wheat— . . . rye . . . flax— . . . hemp— . . . tar— . . . potatoes, . . . cotton, . . . tobacco. Besides these prodigious quantities of various commodities, 9917 immense rafts loaded with timber for building and 2568 with fuel wood . . . the barks are of immense length and width, flat bottomed . . . dreadfully clumsy : . . . The supply of corn for the metropolis is always a subject of the greatest anxiety more so than ever it was at London.

He then proposed that some extensive marsh lands in the Novgorod area might be drained and produce much of the food which St. Petersburg brought from more distant areas. The peasants, however, were too ignorant and unskilled for such a job while if it were started by the government it would only fill “the pockets of directors, overseers, surveyors, measurers, drainers, and, never ending, would be given up as a hopeless undertaking”. If the project were entrusted to the nobility, “I am sure the scheme would be damned for ever, few of them can distinguish the means of bringing such a vast improvement to a successful issue”. There would be little difficulty in obtaining labour which was plentiful and cheap, “especially crown boors whom, [sic] because they have little land, leave their habitations by thousands to hire themselves to others. and

¹ The chetvert meant originally in Russian a quarter or fourth of something. It was also a dry measure, sometimes given as equal to eight bushels which would make it the same as the English “quarter”. In modern times it has been equal to 5.77 bushels. In a later letter Young declared it equal to 5½ bushels. Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,133, fol. 336.

receive, in this gov^t. if by the week one Rouble, & board ; . . . if by the year (Podolsk district) 40 to 50 Roubles ". The culture of potatoes would be very useful to vary the diet of the peasants on fast days which " are religiously observd ", and " amount to one full half part of the year ". He went on to speak of the *obrok* as follows :

. . . the crown has always in her view the good of her peasants, and his present Majesty is not desirous to add to the *obrok* : this is very gracious : But the misfortune in this Country is, that nothing stimulates to agricultural industry among these crown boors. the *Obrok* is not a land-rent, as it is often paid by tradesmen & masons, domestics, & all sorts of jobmen, coachmen &c &c as by those who labour the field.¹

The Rev. Arthur Young's first letter to his mother was sent from Moscow on 26 January, probably in 1806. Most of it is given below :²

My dearest Mother,

. . . The amended state of your health gives us both the most heartfelt pleasure, & we now flatter ourselves that your strength will daily improve. Sunday is the great day of merriness in these countries to high & low. the former have their crowded balls & concerts & card parties. the others amuse themselves at the alehouse, in riding in sledges, walking, also in visiting, but especially during the present severe weather, in sliding down their ice mountains I myself just this instant returned from diverting myself with the same amusement. Tho' none but the lower sort at Mosco follow the diversion, it held out so many temptations, from the astonishing rapidity with which they descend, that I put myself into the arms of one of the bearded guides who are singularly dextrous at the work, having previously ascended the mountain, seated myself in a very slight traineau, the guide behind in the same machine, laid myself straight, and my legs up, leaning entirely back upon my conductor, & down we went with amazing velocity onto the ice that covered the river, my pilot conducting us down the mountain, & afterwards along the surface of the ice, by means of his 2 hands, laying either of them on the ice, on whichever side of the little Sledge it was necessary, in order to guide it. Besides the descent, we skimm'd for 250 yards on the flat ice, when the man raised me up, took up his sledge under his arm, & ascended another hill. I followed, & away we went again down the second, returning to our former station. Posts & rails keep off those who came as mere spectators, of which on a Sunday there are many hundreds. The first time I descended I was rather afraid, but the only sensation was the breath taken from your lungs, which very soon returned, & even the 3^d & 4th descent, not even that, but a most pleasant sensation. Jane stood at the bottom, eyeing me

¹ This statement about *obrok* is borne out by J. Mavor, *An Economic History of Russia* (2nd edn. 1925), i. 195.

² Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/7.

with her glass ; I have persuaded her to partake of the pleasure, on a day when less company [is] on the spot. These ice hills . . . are described in Cox.¹ It is nothing more than 2 very high stages, or frames of deal raised nearly opposite to each other, at the distance . . . of about 250 yards. To the top of them you ascend by common steps, where is a platform 3 or 4 yards square raild round, and an inclind plane, also raild, that accidents might not happen, all covered with ice, is the road by which you descend. . . . This day sennight I dined with old Count Osterman who entertains a numerous company always on this day, for Sunday is the great day of recreation. I went after it to a Prince Gallitzins, & at night to a most sumptuous fête given by a merchant nam'd Lazarof, to all the first people of the Town. It was unexceptionably the first thing of the sort that has been given this winter. . . . He told me that 600 persons were present. The fireworks were extremely beautiful . . . & afterwards the Ball commenc'd, waltzing in 1 room, & country dances in a second, cards in two others, walking in other rooms. At 12 the supper was serv'd, & all of it in one room, &, contrary to establishd usage, men sat by women, & afforded a superb sight, to see so many at a single table. . . . On the Wednesday following we both of us dined with Beckteshof (the Governor) but Jane did not go to the fête preceding . . . the day following, we went to the funeral of Prince Gallitzin, brother to the Grand Chamberlain. the Governor sent an adjutant on horseback to attend us, to get us good places for the croud [sic] in the church was overpowering. the coffin was exposd, & the body uncovered as far as the shoulders. . . . At the end of the numerous rites performd, the intimate relations came round him to kiss his lips, when the chief Bishop present read aloud a Certificate of his excellent life & conduct, &c &c which he put into the bosom of the dead as a passport to St. Peter, to whom he was to shew it, on his arrival before the presence of the apostle !! . . .

Equally interesting was his second letter to his mother written from Kaluga on 16 August, probably in 1806.² After recording his pleasure at his mother's improved state of health he suggested that she come to Russia because it was such a healthy country where no one ever suffered from rheumatism. Paradoxically he continued by mentioning that Jane had been suffering from a very severe toothache and rheumatic pains in her head for upwards of three weeks ! He then proceeded to describe the towns of Russia :

The towns in Russia are laid out & constructed in straight lines intersecting each other at right angles—& this universally : their streets are also extremely broad tho' no foot pavement, & the middle of the road only pavd : the rest in wet weather is very muddy. Another advantage they have over our country towns is that they stand generally on eminences adjoining navigable rivers. this makes them a most striking object to a stranger, but often they are more difficult to

¹ William Coxe, *Travels in Poland, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark* (4th edn., 1792), ii. 275-7.

² Bagshawe Muniiments, B 22/6/8.

ascend than Bath, & the streets, never giving way to the declivity of a hill by turning in circular directions, but always in a line, renders it a curious object but disagreeable to mount on foot. Accommodations at Inns & public houses they have none, far or near, for in fact, the Communication from place to place is a mere trifle, no stage coaches, no public waggons, carts or conveyances for anything but the Post once a week. This renders a town heavy & dull, & the manners of the people add more. in the last thousand Versts I did not meet or overtake but 2 noblemen or gentleman's equipage. No people are ever seen to ride on horseback, or to travel in that manner. for posting is done by posthorses roped to your own carriage, or by peasants horses, the great Satrap with 3 or 4 coaches 2 or 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ coaches, calashes 2 or 3, kibitkas half a score, telegas, some dozen or more (these are the little 1 horse waggons of the peasant)—All this caravan with 50 or more horses of the peasants for which he ought to pay 2 farthings per mile per horse, but often he condescends to accept their Service as a present most generously. Another thing in the country towns of Russia, I mean the Govern^t. towns, is, that there are no booksellers shops, no pretty shops to examine, no parade or gravel walks to promenade in, no public amusements of any sort or kind, nothing that has the appearance of life, activity, bustle, & business. Excessive number of festival days, on which the tradesmen & women dress in their caps of ceremony & robes of buckram, and on a bench adjoining their own door in the street, the women set the greater part of the holiday till the Evening summon them to sip the liquor distilld from rye, which they do in very small quantities ; but the men are jolly drinkers, and stout consumers. . . . You know how fond I used to be in England of a breakfast of white bread & fresh butter—the latter I have not tasted since I left Mosco 4 M^o. ago : all is boiled ! the other is generally in all their large towns execrable, elsewhere in the Country to be never met with. Tea is everywhere capitally good—Salted cucumbers in quantities, cabbage soup sound ; the fine flour from the buckwheat made into croup pudding & the outward coating of the millet taken off also makes an excellent farinaceous & wholesome diet in milk. . . . In fruits this part of Russia does not abound ; now no other than green apples, a few wretched pares : raspberries are in the forests, also strawberries in great quantities. but all over—cherries they have in quantities but not good. . . . The situation of this town is I think superior to all I have yet seen. It is on the Oka, at least 250 yards in width, & the banks on both sides very high indeed. . . . the town covers the bank to the edge of the water : many gilded steeples and green painted house tops and white and red & yellow houses add variety & shew to the scene. . . .

To the above Jane Young added a long postscript :

My Dear Dear Mrs Young !

Arthur has told you how very severely I suffer with the tooth ach & head ach which hinders me from writing, reading, or doing any thing —however I must just write you a few lines & thank you for the Cheese you have sent Arth. which pleases him very much as none good are to be procured at Mosco of the English kind—You are extremely obliging to think of us as you do, I only wish we could return you the same, the will you are sure is not wanting —excepting Furs I do not know anything worth bringing over & they are so enormously dear, if at all handsome. . . .

I long to be at Mosco to receive my parcel, look at my Gown Ribbands &c—I think some of the Mosco Silks might please you & Mary & if I can get nothing else will try for them, they are pretty but very slight—You have no idea how very polite the peasants are to each other & all the common people, they never meet without bowing very low & taking off their hats to each other & the women bend their body & head with their hands before them—

A gap of three years separates the above from the next letter in the Bagshawe Muniments. A few scattered bits of information from other sources add a little to the account of his early years in Russia. Young's *Autobiography* several times reflects the impression which his son's and daughter-in-law's letters made upon him. On 25 February 1806, he commented :

At night letters to us all. Three came from Jane and Arthur. A sad account of the interpreter provided for him, who is an ignorant puppy of a nobleman who is too lazy to do anything. Of all the Governments I have heard of, it seems to be the most stupid, the most ignorant, and the most profligate : the fact, I dare say, is that the army alone is attended [to]. They had the news of the battle of Austerlitz, with a loss as they suppose of 40,000 Russians. Not a family at Moscow but must have lost a relation, yet a grand ball that night, and nothing but gaiety and festivity. They have no feeling. . . .¹

Again on 17 June of the same year he wrote :

A letter from Arthur, he has had a week's fever, and went back to Moscow, which recovered him. It was caused by want of sleep, owing to bugs, lice, fleas, &c, fatigue and vile food. They are horrid savages, and five centuries behind us in all but vice, wickedness, and extravagance.²

Two letters written in 1808 make it clear that the survey of the Moscow Government was actually completed. The first was one of Martha Young's secret letters, written to the Earl of Hardwicke in the hope that he might intervene to speed up Arthur's return to England :

32 Sackville Street
March 16

My Lord,

I have the honour to plead for my excuse the following reason !

My only son Arthur Young has been three years in Mosco . . . to make an agricultural Report of that government . . . altho' it has long since been finished amidst the most untoward & miserable difficulties, he is still unable from the well-known tardiness of that Nation to get it presented to his Imperial Majesty ! his situation of course is rendered indescribably anxious in addition to which he has suffered four or five times by a violent fever & severe sore throat &c from a climate hostile I think to every stranger. . . .

¹ *Autobiography*, pp. 428-9.

² *Ibid.* p. 432.

I heard your Lordship had honoured Mr. Young this day with a call & I am surprized he forgot to mention the above circumstances, he told me when he had the pleasure to write he would take the liberty to request the honour of a recommendation from y^r. Lordship to Lord Royston in behalf of my son, as Mr. Young's various & daily pursuits occupy him so constantly I really fear he will not remember it, which is the sole cause of my doing it. I had very nearly lost my life when Arthur first left us, as Dr. Reynolds can testify. I am now so unwell &c &c. that I little doubt every thing relating to this world will pass from me before his return.

. . . Mr. Young would I know attribute my miserable state to weakness only & therefore as I shall spend a few days with Lord Coventry I take the further liberty of begging a line in answer directed to me Mrs. Young under cover to Earl Coventry Piccadilly. I have the honour to be your Lordships

Obedient &

Very H. S.

M. Young

I take the freedom to believe this letter will not be mentioned.¹

The second proof is to be found in a letter from James Smirnove to Young on 13 September 1808, which also shows that Arthur was planning his trip to the Crimea :

. . . I am very much pleased with your Son's success in the Business, it does him & you great honor ; it will be of great Benefit to my country and I feel a very great share of Satisfaction in the whole of the Business. I think he does Right to make an Excursion into Crimea and I am certain his doing so, on the present occasion, placing in a manner a great confidence in the Emperor by wishing to continue longer in Russia, whilst the two countries pretend to be at variance, will be very agreeable to His Imperial Majesty For I am still of opinion that not many of our Ploughshares will be made into spears against England—much more Ink, than Blood I hope will be spilt on the occasion.²

The Bagshawe Muniments contain six letters which the Rev. Arthur Young wrote to his wife from the Crimea, while she was in Moscow and before she returned to England in the autumn of 1810.³ It seems probable that he left Moscow in the spring of 1809⁴ and it is almost certain that he reached Kaffa in the

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,647, fol. 158. This letter is in the Hardwicke Papers. Lord Royston was the Earl of Hardwicke's eldest son, aged 23, who was lost in a shipwreck off Lübeck on 7 April 1808, presumably returning from a Russian port.

² Ibid. 35,130, fol. 110.

³ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/9-14. The author believes that the order in which these letters is arranged is incorrect chronologically, and that the right order probably is as follows : 11, 13, 9, 14, 12, 10.

⁴ A letter from Martha Young to her husband, dated 14 July 1809, indicates she had received word that Jane was not with Arthur. Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,130, fols. 275-6.

Crimea early in November of that year. The purpose of the trip, to purchase an estate, was achieved early in 1810.

The first letter was written from Kaffa on 19 November 1809.¹ It is so very long that only portions can be reproduced here, but it is interesting for descriptions of the scenery of the Crimea and the social customs of the Tartars :

Arrived at last my dear love ! and a miserable beggarly place it is ! of about 300 creatures, the dregs of all nations. . . . Lodgings ! were shewn such as English hogs would disdain to inhabit. . . . I was egregiously mistaken, in thinking to have found here the society, company, politeness, & attentions of Odessa. . . .

You know the Crimea is inhabited by Tartars, a nation in all respects the reverse of the Russians . . . and as Simpheropol was the first of the Tartar towns that I had seen, my curiosity was rather excited. . . . A Town built with high walls, or the back of their houses, fronting the streets, is alone sufficient to give to any place a gloomy appearance. . . . None but the commonest sort of their women are ever seen in the streets, & even these are always veild, or rather, a long piece of white linnen is thrown or twisted around their heads & upper part of their face, & folded again round the throat, neck, & lower part of the face, so that nothing but a pair of eyes are visible . . . they look like so many ghosts. their legs are covered by cotton trowsers : and it seems at first sight ridiculous enough . . . to behold such wizen'd witches & ancient hags of 3 or 4 score years old turning away their hideous figures to the bare walls (for fear I suppose of being ravish'd). . . . Every man . . . is allowed 7 legal wives ; but his mistresses are unlimited . . . his familie's have separate houses & establishments ; tho' they lodge not far from each other, to allow the husband but a short walk in order to pay his addresses to each, and sleep alternately . . . at each of their respective houses. . . . In my Tour thro' the mountains, we changed horses at Tartar houses, we ate, drank, & slept there, but the women were previously removed, so that we very seldom saw any of the sex. . . . I shov'd myself, however, once into a small courtyard, & entered one of their houses with a view to see some of the women, but was nearly insulted & ill usd, and had I not drawn Rowands Sabre from its sheath, and stood on the defensive, I verily believe they would have fallen upon me, for the women, the moment they saw a stranger, set up their stroop, and shreadk most charmingly, and then hid themselves . . . whilst the dogs barkd furiously, & the men assembled : so finding no chance of succeeding with these fair ones, I left them to ruminate on the event. . . .

. . . I passed on to Bakchisery² the former residence of the Khans of the Tartars : Lodgings were provided me in the ancient palace. The situation of this town is singularly romantic. . . . The ground upon which the town is built is nothing but a very narrow cleft or gulley between the mountains, down which, & thro'

¹ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/11. There is no year given for this letter, but assuming that he left Moscow in the spring of 1809, it is reasonable to suppose that he arrived at Kaffa in November of the same year.

² Bakhtchi-Sarai.

the crevices of the rocks on either side gush out innumerable little streams of the clearest & finest water in the Crimea, which is collected into a number of public fountains for the use of the inhabitants . . . I never before beheld a town so supplied with water ! . . . the scenery is picturesque enough ; houses arising above houses, & streets above streets, & the rocks towering their lofty heads above all, has rendered the spot ever very interesting to the artist. . . . The Palace of the Khan . . . is a very irregular pile of low buildings, consisting of separate houses with balconies, & latticed galleries and a profusion of carving & gilding . . . the attention with which the rock water was conveyd into the palace, and distributed all over it in a number of fountains, is striking . . . the cold bath where the ladies of the harem assembled, had a delicious fountain of cold water, all cut out of Greek marble. . . .

. . . At this town I left my Calash, and hired a telega, and drove to Sebastopol with Ivan. . . . Without being a tide harbour, it is unexceptionally the finest I ever beheld, &, I imagine, equal at least, if not superior to every thing of the kind in Europe, for its size, its depth of water its perfect security, the facility of sailing in or out with any wind, & its ease of defense &c &c. It is land locked on all sides by lofty mountains, & offers many most noble & interesting views. . . .

The Grandeur of the mountain scenery of the Crimea is . . . between Balaclava & Sudar.¹ At Balaclava we mounted our horses for the first time, our party consisting of the Albanian guide & Interpreter, myself, Ivan, & a Tartar on horseback also, & another horse for the baggage, led by the Tartar. . . . Our first visit was to M^r Woodrow at Chorgona, a Norfolk man, who has hired a village . . . for ten years. . . . I did not expect to find any of A. Young's publications in such a desolate place, but M^r W. had brought with him from England 3 or 4 of my fathers works, which have been of use even in the mountains of the Crimea. . . .

About Yalta and Neekeeta the mountain scenery incomparably grand & sublime. 3 or 4 ranges of mountains one rising above the other. . . . Sometimes the road winds for many versts through enchanting glades & groves of oak & elm & maple forests, no wider than a footpath, and the branches on both sides of the road meeting above our heads to shade us from the sun ; with every now & then delightful views of the sloping declivities to the shores of the sea. . . . Sometimes the road takes its direction along the edge of a precipice not wider than a yard, and makes one tremble at the shortness of the distance between ourselves and Eternity : Then it bears its way through groves of walnuts, vine-yards, apples &c, whilst you gather the fruit as you pass under the bows of the overloaded trees extending their arms to refresh the thirsty & weary passenger —Tho late in the season, (the first 8 days of Nov^r.) grapes were still hanging in enormous clusters in many of their gardens. . . .

. . . The inhabitants you know to be Tartars : upon entering any of their houses they send away their women, spread Turkey carpets on the floor, and place pillars [sic] against the walls all around the chamber (chairs & tables & bedsteads are unknown) : they bring you for dinner poachd eggs, delicious white honey, powdered cheese from goats milk, ewes curd, all on a large waiter, & set it before you on the ground, but no knives & forks, the use of them being unknown among them—What I was pleased with so much was, their chimney corner,

¹ Probably Soudak.

& the wood fire in it, the exact counterpart of a farm house in Suffolk, or a neat cottage. From the ceiling hang suspended their fruits to preserve them thro the winter. I was neither incommoded by heat or cold, by wind or rain, by fogs, or damp weather : nor was I tormented, in the least, either by any great or little fleas, bugs, lice, or other vermin. Soon after seating yourself the neighbours enter, pipes in their mouths, and seat themselves without ceremony all around you, & bring fruit offerings from their gardens. . . .

The remainder of the letter is more personal, and only the conclusion is worth quotation :

The state of your health, my dear Jane, is I confess not very flattering, & I sincerely regret that all your application to the faculty has done you so little good. I believe the rigour of Russian winters is too much for your constitution, & that had you spent the past summer in the Ukraine, and the approaching winter in the mountains about Yalta and Uskut, your health would have been re-established. . . . The Duke told me that he had written to the minister who had refus'd me permission to buy land with boors, and that my application for rank has been equally refus'd ! Farewell. I have been 4 hours writing to you : & no pleasure so great as writing to those we tenderly love. . . .

Young's second Crimean letter to his wife was short and not very important, but one part of it has some interest :¹

But, what is still more interesting is the news you have sent me of the Admiral being summoned to Petersbg. Not one human being in this town knew it, till I had communicated the intelligence—not even the Governor himself. . . . As any news of this sort is extremely valuable and interesting, you should never defer one single post from informing me, because it shews here that I am in correspondence with those who are upon all interesting subjects well informed, &, secondly, it gives me a certain degree of importance when it is found that the best source of intelligence arrives from me. . . .

His third letter, dated 19 February 1810,² is also one of the less important ones. His Russian servant, Ivan, had been drunk for two days. He had recently been over to Karazoubazar to examine two possible estates, one of them a "most desirable property" with a "large & well furnished" mansion, and with "vast gardens, rivers, mills". The only trouble was its cost. He asked Jane to enquire whether he could mortgage such a property. He also made one curious request of her :

If you could send me a very small pocket edition in one volume of *Homer's Iliad* in Greek, it would be an acceptable present ; as they talk much that language

¹ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/13. The only date on this letter is "Jany 22". It must be 1810, for Jane was in England before the end of the year.

² Ibid. B 22/6/9.

here, (tho' not in the pure style of Homer's age) I am often at a loss for expressions, as I have not a single Greek book here, & none I am so fond of as the father of Greek poetry.

Young's fourth Crimean letter to his wife was probably written in March 1810.¹ As will be seen, it was written primarily to persuade Jane to invest her money in Russia. On the whole the letter leaves the impression that he was perhaps trying to gain control over her money and that relations between husband and wife were becoming somewhat strained :

The times being so prodigiously in favour of bringing money over from England to invest it in the funds of this country : and as you will return hither at the expiration of one, or at most of two years, I put it to your good sense & judgment, whether it would it [sic] not be infinitely more prudent to take advantage of the present critical moment, when the exchange is so favourable for the purpose . . . of drawing upon England for your £1000 sterling, which would give you at 17 p^r C^t : rouble . . . *fourteen thousand*, & some odd roubles, which at 10 p^r C^t : is *one thousand four hundred* roubles annually ; which, as soon as the Exchange returns to its ordinary course with England, will bring you in £175 sterling yearly ; whereas from the same sum in England, you can get no more than 4 p^r C^t : or £40 sterling, annually ! in other words your Capital will return you more than Four times over the interest that it now does. . . . As you will soon return here, would it not be advisable to draw your money from Eng^d. ? Will you not want it here ?—Or, shall I pay you interest for it, and let me invest it on Livestock, which will pay me above 20 p^r C^t : profit ? At all events it appears very imprudent to go to Eng^d without bringing it hither—I have received your last L^r dated February 28. . . . It is short and rough : So you go to Masquerades ! which is an honour I never enjoyed with you : Who was your party ? You may detail me the particulars if you will.—I never write to you indecently : what do you mean ? So the Devil is among you at Mosco ! Has he made you no visit ? We have laughed much at your agreeable description of Old Nick. . . .

As I love to follow your example, give me leave to finish my Letter in your own manner "Adieu I have time for no more nor indeed have anything more to write about" ² neither subscription, signature, &c &c.

Young's fifth letter, dated from his new estate at Karagoss on 8 July,³ was very long and gave detailed instructions to Jane about things to send him from England after her return. Indeed

¹ Bagshawe Muniments B 22/6/14. This letter has no date whatever. My attribution is based on his statement that he had received her last letter dated 28 February.

² In this sentence the writer attempted to copy Jane's scrawl.

³ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/12. There is no year listed in the letter, and a pencil note on the manuscript reads "1810 or later". Since the letter makes it apparent that Jane is still in Russia it cannot be later than 1810.

the chief interest of the letter lies in showing what an English gentleman farmer considered desirable to furnish an estate and operate a farm in the Crimea.

. . . Respecting the progress I make in my affairs, I have long since told you that I have bought Karagoss, a small property of about three thousand deseteens of Land : 18 versts from Caffa ; . . . You know, without my specifying the particulars, what a number of little items are wanting for a person who sets up housekeeping in the Desert, whether they come from London or Mosco : Plate, linnen, & China are wanted, this comprehends much. . . .

My health is tolerable, thank God, in this hot weather. I have got 20 soldiers cutting hay for me : and as labour is dreadfully dear in this country, I give them one half of all they cut, instead of wages. . . . It is not that I have actual possession of Karagoss, only a slice of 3 or 400 Des. which remained unlett. . . . I have paid Stutz R^o : *two thousand* in advance : $\frac{1}{2}$ the remainder as soon as ever I can draw it from Mosco : & the rest on New Years day.—Octob. 1 I take possession. I hope to make from 8 to 10 p^r C^t. clear, of my capital after the first 2 years : but so many repairs &c are wanted on a property, held for so many years by an old man who neglected it so much, that all I get from it, must be laid out for 2 or 3 years.¹ Besides, I have cattle, sheep, Horses & boors to buy. . . .

It is lamentable to be left alone in this wide empire ! I shall get nothing done for me at Mosco, now that you and M^r Rowand are about leaving it. Hawes will do nothing beyond answering my letters & sending me or receiving money —which I am very thankful for, for he is very accurate . . . & all his statements extremely satisfactory. . . .

I am now setting at table, stripped of all my cloaths, but my shirt, and a thin morning callico gown, and Tartar yellow morocco slippers ;—at night, covered only with one sheet. . . . Whenever at Caffa, I bathe in the sea. the evenings & the mornings are truly delightful, and the nights very refreshing. . . .

Respecting servants, when I live here, it will be impossible to do anything without some slaves. Field Labour is so extravagantly dear (never at this time of the year less than 1 R^o daily, and board) that if you could buy me but 2 or 3 families for domestic servants . . . they w^d. be invaluable : 15 or 20 families

¹ Since the dessiatin was roughly two and two-third acres, the estate should have been about 8,000 acres in size, and it was located about twelve miles from Kaffa. Young states that he bought it from "Stutz". P. S. Pallas, *Travels through the Southern Provinces of the Russian Empire in the years 1793 and 1794* (2nd edn. 1812), ii. 263-4, refers to "the country seat of the hospitable and gallant General de Schütz, in the vicinity of the village of Karagos" and continues : "His estate lies in a fertile, rising plain, . . . contiguous to the manor-house, a vineyard has been planted with three thousand vine-stocks ; and there is also an apiary, which frequently contains three hundred bee-hives. Beside the kitchen and flower gardens, we observed on the opposite side of the brook, extensive old orchards. . . . The breeding of numerous cattle is here successfully attended to. . . ." Young implies that the estate had been suffered to decay between 1794 and 1810. My colleague, Professor John C. Adams, suggests that the proper name of the estate may have been Karagoz, meaning "Black Eye".

for labour w^d be sufficient for ploughing, reaping & mowing &c &c—I apprehend they are to be had for 150 R^o. per *male soul* including the old & infants. . . .

One commission should be done for me, as early as possible, after your arrival in Eng^d. which is to buy me some garden seeds . . . all the best sorts of cabbages . . . brocoli, cauli flower, borecole, red cabbage: . . . melon . . . Pease . . . Windsor beans . . . Lettuce . . . Spinnach. Cucumber seed, of every sort . . . Radish & Turnip Seed. . . . With the seeds should be sent the very best Gardeners Calendar. Karagoss is well suited for a kitchen garden, as water from the river flows in this hot weather through & over every bed, & every channel & furrow in every part of the garden. & the soil very fine, yielding great crops, tho' never manured in the memory of man. . . .

Another commission I hope you will remember & execute in Eng^d.—viz: the ground plan, section, &c. of a small but well contrived malthouse . . . 2^{dly}, the same drawings . . . for an *oost*, or building for the drying of hops. In Eng^d buildings cost money: with us, they are much cheaper. . . . I write to you rather than to my f.[ather] for these things, because I know that you are likely to execute them, & that he is not . . . you should always carry in your mind, that, by sea from London to Odessa, *just before* the war broke out . . . the House of Baring & Comp. & Mair & Co. forwarded . . . almost every species of Agricultural instrument to Odessa. I know this well enough, because they were sold . . . at Caffa, as well as Odessa, & upon very reasonable terms. What is most dreadfully wanted at Karagoss, is one of the best, but strongest wheel ploughs in Eng^d. . . . the Tartar plough . . . requires, never less than 6 yoke of oxen, 7 & 8 yoke very frequent: the expence of oxen is therefore so very great, that several families always join their cattle in one team to break up the turf. . . . To the plow you send, send 5 or 6 shares, even a dozen w^d be better . . . with this plow add . . . one of my fathers, or Small's swing plough, with one dozen shares, and 2 or 3 breasts, and a $\frac{1}{2}$ dozen reaping hooks, & another $\frac{1}{2}$ dozen sickles—one dozen of the very best country made spades for the garden; for remember, that all those that Baring & Co sent out 3 years ago . . . were worth very little, being London made things, whereas if you set one of your Bradfield Labourers to chose them, they will last 20 London made spades. add one dozen broad shovels, and the *iron part* of one dozen small hay or stable forks. . . . Also one dozen of the small garden hoe: one dozen d^o of a larger double cutting hoe . . . 4 scythes to cut bushes & brambles: and one $\frac{1}{2}$ dozen for mowing hay. . . . To these add a compleat, and well filled case, or large farriery box of instruments. . . . Likewise a large case of carpenters Tools. . . .

Two or three cases of tableknives & forks . . . 2 or 3 good carving knives & forks. A book or two on the art of cookery. Spoons of various sorts (being silver). . . . Good cheese, North Wiltshire, Cheshire, and Stilton, will keep most admirably in Karagoss cellars. Port wine I have not alas! tasted these two years, nor anything but rotgut Crim swill nor one drop of beer, which is the reason, I suppose, why the scurvy here and there shews itself. A Dinner service of china plate, and a tea Sett likewise, well packed, might be sent with ease to Odessa & arrive safe. . . . Among other articles . . . a few handsome candlesticks; urn, coffee pot, also teachest, sugar kiddy: spice boxes. Silver labels for wine, and particularly a capital assortment of new fashioned corkscrews. . . . A Land-measuring wheel is essentially wanted: and those little shilling books, which give explanations about it, and about the contents of haystacks &

square & solid measures in weight. *A Good Collection in small paper packets of all our curious or common flower garden seed will be invaluable.*

9 in the Evening, the weather is so very hot, that there is no stirring abroad from 8 in the morning till 4 or 5 in the afternoon with any pleasure. . . . I sleep very little at night from the same cause, but after dinner manage to get an hour or two of rest : yet I eat well, and drink abundantly, especially mead. brandy I dont touch, and wine is not *haveable*. . . . Karagoss is very gay . . . for it has been taken (the hall) posession of by the General and his myrmidons. . . . It is now 5 in the morning . . . and very cool. Yet I set in my shirt. . . . The fleas are so numerous, that my shirt is soiled after one days wear as much as if it had been shoved into a necessary House.

. . . I must finish with wishing you a good journey, prosperous & short. and when you arrive in Eng^d. remember to write . . . of all that goes forward. . . .

Adieu Ever my dearest I am

Yours most affectionately

A Young

Young's last letter to his wife before she left for England was sent from Karazoubazar on 7 August 1810.¹

My dear Jane.

Your L^r of the 12th July, was put into my hands last night, upon arriving here from Karagos, together with the Manifest, (written in your best style) two L^{rs} from my mother of the dates of Octob. 22^d, & Octob. 24: 1809: (very ancient L^{rs}:). . . . The weather is resplendently fine in this country : & a clear sun from April to Octob: so that I am quite sick with so much light, & pant for rain & fogs : . . . My health is as yet, good : tho it is not so with all, for I swim, & take exercise, & rise early, & drink moderately, & never water ; but always mixed with wine or brandy. . . . Poor Lord Coventry's death has turned out, what I hardly ever expected . . . & his legacy and annuity to you put you above dependence on your father : a circumstance which must be extremely satisfactory :—the 200 £ to Mary she, indeed, most richly earned, and most richly merited.—It appears, from inspecting the manifest, that you may, with the utmost safety, put your money to interests in the new Bank, receiving 6 pr cent, and your capital be redeemed in 1817 : which is the smallest part of the benefit ; for, the augmentation of the Capital itself, by transferring it from Eng^d to Russia will, it appears, be at least in the proportion of 3 to 2 . . . so vast a difference, as not to be lost sight of. . . .

The power of Attorney has been dispatched long ago, and long ago, no doubt, in your possession. . . . One ploughman & his family from England it is essential to have at Karagos. that is to say, the requisite qualifications are good character, & the *first* of EVERY point, is SOBRIETY. for Brandy is here so cheap, that, not only the Russian colonists live drunk their whole lives, but the imported Germans follow the same trade to the total ruin of the country—2 requisite, knowledge of his business ; to be a seedsman ; to be a *yardman*, or to take care of working bullocks : for all our lands are worked with oxen : his wife to understand in perfection the art of managing a dairy—And, above all, to engage them for 3

¹ Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/10.

years certain upon the terms of my finding house & food for selves & family : if workable children, they too to be employed. The next thing wanted, is a Gardener & family (unmarried persons will never stop in any one place long) who knows the art of grafting fruit trees, and the whole art of orcharding as well as the kitchen garden, together with the knowledge of a nurseryman, or the art of planting & raising trees in general, be they fruit or timber—His wife to know well some useful art, even washing, cooking, taking care of a house, &c &c &c for let it be a maxim, to send nothing over but what will be useful & valuable : a slut, a dawdle, a trull, a mere scullion, or mop-squeezer will not pay for their transport.

As to Letters that come *fresh & hot* out of England, I shall never grudge 25 R^s each. . . . Seriously, send them, every month or 6 weeks : and, whenever anything essential is necessary to be communicated, dispatch them instantly : and, above all, fix *the channel of correspondence*, before you quit Russia : . . .

I sent some time ago a plan of Karagos house and garden : the house is greatly out of repair, & will require some money to be laid out, before it can be honoured with its new hostess. . . .¹ Lime ; bricks ; stones ; tiles and timber must be fetched this autumn : thank God ! not so dear as in Eng^d : but then, to counterbalance this, English work is far superior, and English workmen far cheaper. . . .

The Rev. Arthur Young did not return to England until the spring of 1814. In vain his sister had pleaded with him in 1811 when their father became blind : “ Oh, Ar., as I greatly believe he will be entirely blind, do try to come to him.”² It was probably two and a half years later before Arthur left the Crimea. It seems that the whole trip home was most difficult. From St. Petersburg he apparently wrote his sister that he was in great distress, as the following letter from an unknown Edward Moberly to Arthur Young indicates :

Coleman Street, Jan'y 14th, 1814.

Sir,

. . . I am sorry it was not in my power to give Miss Young any satisfactory information respecting her brother—the more I reflect on his situation, the more I am persuaded that the letter he wrote, was in a moment of irritation, & that not being a stranger in Russia but knowing that there is a British consul & several most respectable English houses of trade at Petersburg, it is impossible, were he in the distress represented by his letter, that he should not think of writing to one or other of *them*. I have known Mr. Rowand and Mr. Hawes a great many years & can, from my own knowledge, assure you that they are both most respectable men & bear excellent characters, so that whatever inconvenience Mr. Young may have suffered, I cannot believe to have proceeded from anything improper on their part.³

¹ This sounds as though he expected Jane to join him later, after her visit to England.

² *Autobiography*, p. 455, note.

³ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,132, fol. 3.

From a letter which the Rev. Arthur Young wrote on 6 March 1814, to his father from "Gottenburgh" in Sweden, it is clear that he left St. Petersburg on 12 January and reached Gothenburg late in the same month but had been prevented from proceeding further by ice in the harbour. He had travelled across southern Finland to Abo whence he had gone across the Gulf of Bothnia via the Aland Islands. Forty-two hours had been spent crossing the frozen ice of the Gulf in a sledge.

I was the first who had passed it in a sledge this winter. There was some danger on this occasion, & in some places open water was seen : but upon the whole the ice was strong enough to bear us. . . .

Finally he had crossed Sweden from Stockholm to Gothenburg. The whole journey had been very expensive. "I have drawn upon you for larger sums to defray my journey, than I was warranted by your letters last April & May. . . ." In addition he had been forced to borrow from a fellow traveller. The Rev. Arthur Young did not like what he saw of Sweden and contrasted it very unfavourably with Russia. As usual his language was strong :

God alone knows when we shall be disengaged from this detested and inhospitable town : perhaps as dear a place as can be found in Europe. . . . After having seen so much of Russia, & always told to consider Sweden as far superior to her great rival, I never was so mortified and disgusted as I have been since the very first moment of my arrival in [torn] barbarous, savage, Gothic country the cleverness, activity, knowledge, & invention of a Russian is now well known : the stupidity, dullness, meanness, rascality, pride and ignorance of the Swedes surpasses all that I could have believed. Russia is a thousand years before Sweden in arts & inventions. I have been plundered & cheated & robbed by these brutes. . . .¹

The Rev. Arthur Young remained in England for just about a year and a half. He brought with him his Russian servant Ivan. In August 1815, Marianne Francis described the Youngs as she found them at Bradfield that summer :

Mr. Young's family is composed of a daughter, unmarried, & a married son & daughter. The son has been residing 9 years in the Crimea, in Moscow &c &c is full of curious accounts. He surveyed the province of Moscow for the Russian government ; & because he wd have lost much of the money resulting from the survey, if he had transferred it to this country, from the state of exchange, he purchased with it an Estate in the Crimea, of I think, 9000 acres, with a fine

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,132, fols. 57-8.

stone house upon it, & a church. This he now means to sell if he can that he may live henceforth in his native land. He & his wife talk Russ together with a Russian servant whom they brought over, & someday, suppose, his travels, with all the information collected by the experience of so many years, will be ushered into the world.¹

There are several other indications that he meant to publish his travels. He dined at some time during this trip with Longman, the bookseller, and it may be inferred that he had hopes that Longman might take his manuscript.² His father helped him with the work but was doubtful whether it would ever be published :

I do not sleep well at night, and, therefore am up generally at 4 o'clock, and call my son to give him some assistance for a couple of hours in the Journal of his travels, which however goes on so slowly that I know not if they will be ever published ; he had very uncommon opportunities to have made a most entertaining book but sadly neglected them, when the notes ought to have been made.³

In another letter the father wrote : " Lingley was my old amanuensis, but Arthur entirely employs him."⁴

In the spring of 1815 the Rev. Arthur Young inserted an advertisement in the Suffolk newspapers which attracted considerable attention. The London *Times* described it as follows :

The Rev. Arthur Young, in an advertisement published in the Suffolk newspapers, announces his intention of leaving England, and settling on an estate of 9,000 acres, in the Crimea, "the most beautiful province in the Russian Empire, where the proprietor (the Rev. Gent. himself), during a residence of five years, never saw the face of a tax-gatherer". He invites the farmers of England, whom he considers in danger of ruin, to accompany him, and is ready to receive proposals either for letting or selling parcels of the land.⁵

The tone of the advertisement was sufficiently critical of his native country to stamp its author as a malcontent. Lord Egremont, however, viewed the Crimean estate quite differently :

¹ John Rylands Library, English MS. 584, fol. 135. This is a letter from Marianne Francis to Mrs. Piozzi. This is the first indication that the real reason for Young's purchase of the Crimea estate was his desire to avoid loss from variations in exchange.

² N.Y. Public Library, Berg Collection, Burney Papers, Arthur Young to Marianne Francis. Although this letter is not dated, it seems almost certain that it was written in 1814 or 1815.

³ Ibid. 12 August 1814.

⁴ Ibid. 7 December 1814.

⁵ *The Times*, 8 May 1815, p. 3.

When an Englishman has bought an estate upon the Black Sea he has only two things to choose out of, to go & live there or to get out of it as soon and as well as he can and I hope your son will get some money for his estate tho' to tell you the truth I expect nothing for him but bad swindling bills & perhaps a Lawsuit or two. . . .¹

By early September 1815, the Rev. Arthur Young was in London making preparations to return to Russia. Probably as a result of his advertisement he had persuaded a certain Mr. and Mrs. Holderness and their family to accompany him, although on what terms is not known. On 9 September a friend wrote to Arthur Young :

. . . the ship is expected to drop down to Gravesend Tomorrow—& to sail on Monday—the Holdernesses take 2 maids—Mr. Arthur has had a severe job at the Customs House, but it is all compleated . . . in the passport he is Colonel Young—& Captain Holderness is the title of his fellow traveller—the party of the latter are 10. . . .²

In a letter to Mrs. Piozzi on 7 October, Marianne Francis commented on the incongruity of his new title : “They have registered him in his ship, *Colonel* Young, I know not why. But the *Rev. Col.* Young, seems a strange anomaly.”³ Two days later Marianne wrote to Arthur Young :

. . . poor Mr. Arthur is still in Sackville Street, ill, with his old disorder, the quinsey. But he does not keep his bed, & still expects to sail, in a day or two. He is only waiting because his compagnons de voyage are not quite ready.⁴

Four days later, on 13 October, Marianne wrote two letters. One was to Arthur Young : “I saw Mr. Arthur yesterday, he seemed pretty well ; & to-day, I hear he is gone. . . .”⁵ The other was to her sister, Charlotte Barrett :

Young Arthur is gone, poor fellow, at last. He had a bad quinsey, immediately before he started & was blistered & bled most fearfully. But he is used to quinsies & does not mind. . . .⁶

The return trip to the Crimea was anything but pleasant. The night he set sail the “Reverend Colonel” wrote a letter to his father which reveals all too clearly the bluntness of his moral standards.

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,133, fol. 52.

² Ibid. fol. 43. The friend was Mrs. Charlotte Broome, Marianne’s mother.

³ John Rylands Library, English MS. 584, fol. 136.

⁴ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,133, fol. 60. ⁵ Ibid. fol. 64.

⁶ N.Y. Public Library, Berg Collection, Burney Papers.

Gravesend, Thursday October 12.

My dear Sir—

In a state of convalescence, thank God, I started from Charing Cross at 1 this afternoon, & reached Gravesend at $\frac{1}{2}$ past five, in one of the public stages, fearfully, most fearfully afraid of a relapse : & as fate would have it, we had contrived, as we thought very cleverly, to smuggle on board our ship a number of heavy packages, amounting in the whole to 34 very heavy cases & large trunks, besides lighter ones, off Blackwall ; so we expected to meet with neither search or inquiry here ; but we were wofully mistaken : In fact 12 of *my* cases underwent examination at the custom house in Tharnes Street ; & about these therefore there was no question : but our other 34 were hauld over the coals at this most detestable of all imposing places. I arrivd, as I said before, at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 5 : having had nothing to eat since 8 in the morning, very weak, & wishing only for quiet, when the very moment after I had got out of the coach, I was taken to the custom house here : a letter there was read to me of 34 packages sent on board the Aldbro in my name & Mr. Holderness' which had not passd the custom house, all supposd to be illegal. I was no doubt surprizd, but we had, most fortunately, to deal with a gentleman here, to my utter surprize, he requested me to accompany him on board, all our baggage was hauld on deck, two or three cases were examined, containing wearing apparel ; books ; & sundries containing nothing contraband, or liable to duty : he took the rest as granted for having the same things & the whole passed safe thro the clutches of these sharks, & that most fortunately. . . .¹

The trip from Gravesend to the Swedish shore was made very quickly with favouring gales, but there were long delays in getting through the Danish straits and into the Baltic, and Riga was not reached until 6 November.² In one letter the Rev. Arthur Young described the miseries of the voyage, confined with the whole Holderness family in the same cabin, all seasick except Mr. Holderness :

The Cabin from England, to this place has been in a state of the most compleet confusion ; squalling, crying ; screaming ; retching, has sickened me most thoroughly of sea voyages. . . . The Children's shrieks and lamentations exceeded all that I had before met with : & for a £1000 I would never encounter the like again. Mrs Holderness has borne the voyage but moderately : her baby, & her squalling brats have given me a distaste for all such travelling. . . .³

On 17 November, the day before they left Riga, the Rev. Arthur Young wrote again to his father, describing the complications of taking a whole family to the Crimea :

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,133, fols. 66-7.

² Ibid. fol. 78. This information is found in a letter of 25 October written in Kyrko Sound, where they were becalmed.

³ Ibid. fol. 85. Written 30 October at anchor off Copenhagen.

We arrived here Nov. 6 all well ; since when ; involvd in immense confusion. from 70 to 100 great trunks & other heavy packages of the Holdernesses including only 12 of mine. We can scarcely move for lumber & are & have been trying to get out of town but our luggage is too frightful to expect that we shall be less than 6 weeks from here to Karagoss. We go tomorrow with 12 horses & 4 carriages 1 man & 1 woman Servant. Everything here immensely dear.¹

The journey from Riga to Karagoss took almost three months, from 18 November 1815 to 3 February 1816. It was described in considerable detail by Mrs. Mary Holderness in her book, *Journey to the Crimea*.² To her the trip was both an exciting adventure and a trying ordeal. The wagon in which the trip was made was fixed up for sleeping and was not too uncomfortable, but it had no springs. There was seldom any privacy for her in the post stations where they frequently stayed over night. The most comfortable stops were those where "Mr. Y." had a letter of recommendation to a nobleman or government official. The route followed by the party was in general that of the Duna and Dnieper valleys, and the chief cities visited were Kiev and Odessa.

The Rev. Arthur Young also wrote an account of the trip to his father from Odessa on 30 January 1816 :

I have sent this day a short note to you thro' Thompson & Co : merely to state that I was compelled to draw upon you for £50. Odessa is greatly improvd, notwithstanding the havoc by the plague which swept off a fourth of its population. This year the British government, thro' her agent here, will export 160,000 tchetverts of wheat, & as the quantity is large, this order has already advanced the price to 31. 32, & even 33 Rubles the tchetvert of 5½ bushels. Estates

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,133 fol. 105.

² M. Holderness, *Journey from Riga to the Crimea with Some Account of the Manners and Customs of the Colonists of New Russia* (2nd edn. 1827). The trip is described in the first part of the volume, pp. 1-104. The account shows clearly that Mrs. Holderness was a woman of refinement. It is well and interestingly written. On page 214, in a reprint of her preface to the first edition, Mrs. Holderness states that she resided at Karagoss until March 1820. Unfortunately she nowhere gives a description of the Karagoss estate. In the preface to the second edition, page iii, she states that she had omitted certain materials from the first edition, "lest I should interfere with the intentions of a friend, who, I had reason to believe, had directed his thoughts to the same subject. That difficulty however has now not only been completely removed, but the kindness of the friend alluded to, has supplied me with much very important additional information. . . ." It seems almost certain that the friend was the Rev. Arthur Young and that he had completely abandoned the idea of publishing before his death.

advance rapidly in value : & yet, large properties in this neighbourhood may be at any time bought so cheap, so wonderfully cheap, in reference to the price of wheat, the great staple of this country, as almost to exceed credibility. Countess Pototsky sells 6000 Deseteens including 200 boors male, for 100,000 Rubles or £4,166 for 16500 acres, of admirable land : in round numbers about 5 shillings per acre. . . . & it might be added, that boors, crops, stocks, proprietors house, &c are included in the 100,000.

We have had a terrible journey, of 2 months & more from Riga : . . . The women & children have been overthrown, run away with, the carriages broken to pieces, all but drowned [sic] in passing the rivers : buried in snow, & dragged in the mud, & one of our unfortunate drivers hurled from his seat, & killed on the spot. We have been starved, frozen, baked—& almost roasted : & lived, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, among Jews & Jews only ; for these are almost the only people we met with on the road. M^rs Holderness you know took 4. of her children, an infant of 2 months at her setting out has performed the journey with admiration. & the other children are in excellent health, as well as the rest of the party. but our pockets have woefully failed. We are 12 in number, & travel with four carriages & 14 to 16 horses. . . .¹

Very shortly after the Rev. Arthur Young started back to Russia in 1815 a letter came to England, apparently in Russian, which his father sent to James Smirnove for translation. Smirnove's reply did not give a very favourable account of Karagoss from a financial point of view.

The Papers, which you have sent me today contains an account of monies received and expended on your son's Estate at Karagos from the 20th of April 1813 to the End of the year 1814—The receipts for the year 1814 amount to Roubles 5343. 22^{co}. the Expenses of the same year amount to do 5270. 82. which shews, that the *Pith* of the Contents, which you desired me to give you, is rotten and unsound, being only the Balance in favor of the Estate R^o 72. 40^{co}. . . . I must not however pass in Silence, that of the Sum expended, M^r Arthur Young has received 800 Roubles . . . it appears that the Estate is in the Progress of Improvement and which of course will improve its Income. . . .²

The last eleven years of the life of the Rev. Arthur Young are very scantily documented. In June 1817, his father wrote to Marianne Francis : “ I had lately a letter from Arthur, written in a more quiet, and tranquil, state of mind than common with him ; M^rs. Holderness and her children were with him, waiting the return of her vagabond husband. . . . ”³ A little more than a month later Young wrote again to Marianne : “ Mr. Louis Way of Stanstead Park called on me in Town to make enquiries

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35,133, fols. 336-7.

² Ibid. fol. 129.

³ N.Y. Public Library, Berg Collection, Burney Papers, 3 June 1817.

about Arthur's Karagos Estate as he wants such a place for an establishment of converted Jews, it being sufficiently near to the Jewish districts in Poland."¹ On 31 May 1818, the Rev. Arthur Young wrote a long letter to his father, describing Mr. Way's recent visit to Karagoss and his own interview with Alexander I of Russia:²

My dear Sir

In one of your letters of last year you stated Mr. Lewis Way's intention of paying us a visit: & from Rowands letter to me of Jan^{ry} 15, I send you the following extract—"The chief purpose of my writing you at present is, in consequence of an English gentleman who has arrived here & who wished his name not to be mentioned to you as yet, having expressed a desire to purchase Karagoss. At his request I make you the following queries . . . 1. How many English acres. 2. Whether the church . . . is of stone, and what distance from the house? . . . 3. Whether the house is fit for a family. . . . 4. and last. Whether you would take £4000 St. for the whole property, including every thing, house, furniture, utensils. . . . If the bargain should be struck he will engage to pay the £4000 in London immediately. This gentleman means to be in the Crimea early in the spring, as he will not of course purchase the Estate without seeing it. He says, if it answers the description he has heard of it, he will give the money he offers, but not a farthing more"—So much for Mr Rowands Extract. No offer for the purchase of a property could be plainer or more downright: nor could any queries be sent, to which answers might be returned of a more satisfactory nature. I accepted his offer: the church was about 300 yards from the house: a stone building; extensive: and in good repair, but not fitted up with pews &c the house was fit for any decent family in moderate circumstances of life: it is true the wings are tumbling down: & $\frac{1}{2}$ the house rebuilt of stone from the foundation, roofed and sashed, but not stoned or floored, nor any furniture to this $\frac{1}{2}$. The other half we inhabited: All the furniture bad:—May 2 soon after breakfast I walked into the garden, & soon after Mr Way drove up in his Dormouse, with 6 post horses; Then he descended, and accompanied by a Polish Rabbi in spectacles, Mr. Solomon walked across the Lawn, into the house, opened the door and entered the hall; here they were met by Mrs. Holderness who had been long apprized of his coming . . . & upon his opening the hall door, she immediately recognized the man, and upon her saying that Mr. Young had for sometime been expecting his arrival, he began to be angry, and to blame Mr. Rowand for informing me of his name. She instantly informed him not only that you apprized me almost a year ago of his intention but that the whole town of Kaffa were acquainted with his arrival at Odessa. . . . He did not seem to relish this: he asked her if I was at home; she replied I was only in the garden; and that by ringing the bell I should be at home in five minutes. No! No! No!

¹ N.Y. Public Library, Berg Collection, Burney Papers, 14 July 1817. There is a brief note on Lewis Way (1772-1840) in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, which implies that he was very gullible in his relations with the Jews and was in general a fantastic figure.

² Bagshawe Muniments, B 22/6/6.

I cant stop, Maam ; the post boys are in a hurry. Tell Mr. Y. I am going to Kaffa : I shall stop there about a week or ten days ; or till the Emperor has passed . . . as he crossed the Hall he momentarily glanced at 2 or 3 rooms, new built, plastered, roofed & ceiled, but neither floored, stoved, or doored ; and certainly the house is not a fit residence for the owners of Stanstead Park any more than 4000 £ is upon a level with 200,000 £. . . . Away then they went . . . Returning home about an hour after departure, M^{rs}. Holderness informed me of the particulars of his visit, that he walked about the house with his hat on his head, asking many questions & not waiting to receive any answers and talking altogether in a sort of manner as utterly to preclude his receiving any satisfactory information the watch all the while in his hand—Stunned as I was upon hearing all this on returning from my walk ; nevertheless. I called up him at his lodgings next morning. I found him at his table eveloped [sic] among papers, books, bibles, Jews & gentiles . . . Tartar & Hebrew Bibles were open on the table, and thro' his Jewish interpreter he was asking more questions than he received replies when I entered the room. He then distributed a few bibles & dismissed the party, till we two were left alone in the room : then after a short harangue of the length of time since we had seen each other, he entered at some length into the objects of his journey . . . his accidentally becoming acquainted with a man who left him £300,000, his purchase of Stansted, the dying bequest of his wealthy friend to spend the money to the glory of God ; his own conversion . . . & then he adverted to the restoration of Israel to Jerusalem ; an event, which he seemed to think as certain of taking place within 8 or 10 years. . . . All this occupied him nearly two hours . . . for he quoted every prophet . . . and finally put into my hand the Charter of Izrael, fully drawn out at length, sealed, signed, & witnessed from the prophets . . . and as the map was spread on the table before him, he pointed out immediately the road by which the Israelites were packing up their baggage & preparing to return to Jerusalem : namely those from Poland . . . first to the shores of the Black Sea, and thence in shipping : & all the coasts of the Mediterranean in English vessels . . . whilst the 10 tribes who certainly composed the population of all America . . . would also return by shipping. The time of the return being settled, and the road arranged, I thought I might now hint about the disposition of my Estate. He took it up immediately ; said, his plans were in some measure altered, that the Emperor had promised land for an Establishment near Taganroc . . . & when I read him Rowands Letter, he got over all that by saying, Mr. Rowand had acceeded [sic] his commission, he said little about Karagoss, and seemed to despise [sic] it altogether : others afterwards informed me he was disappointed in the views of the house, expecting no doubt to discover in the deserts of Tartary Solomons temple. . . . In one respect I essentially served him, or rather the cause he is embarked in. . . . As I knew Mr. Way had written to those in the suite of the Emperor to procure an audience at Kaffa, & that he did not succeed, I procured the very thing he wanted.

You may be curious to know what circumstances led me forward on this occasion. Nothing but the honour of conversing with so gracious and benevolent a Monarch¹ induced me to venture on such a step : & indeed I was most

¹ That Alexander I did make a tour of the Crimea from 21 May to 31 May, New Style, 1818, is confirmed in N. K. Shil'der, *Imperator Aleksandr Pervyi*,

graciously received ; and His Majesty had the goodness to say, he was sorry he could not himself visit Karagoss. The interview passed within sight of Karagoss at the nearest post station where the horses were changed within five versts of my house. H. M. accosted me in English, asked several questions about the Estate, how long I had lived there, what English were with me, how I liked the country ; whether you was still alive ; what improvements I had made here, whether I found the climate suitable to English agriculture ; & whether many plants which flourished in England could be introduced successfully here where the climate was so dry. These questions I readily answered, & apparently to the satisfaction of the Emperor. We stood together, surrounded by a croud [sic] of people, for ten minutes, in conversation till the horses being changed, H. M. drove off, & I accompanied H. M. by the side of his carriage till we came to the bounds of the property still conversing all the time in the most affable & condescending manner. I then took my leave & returned home. 3 days afterwards I was honored with a second interview : it was now that H. M. desired me to inform Mr. Way that he was sorry he could not see him at Kaffa : as before stated, when I immediately said, that with H. M. permission Mr. Way would wait upon H. M. at Simpheropol : To this H. M. readily consented. . . . In consequence Mr. Way went over to Simpheropol & had a long conversation there with the Emperor : but I saw no more of Mr. Way. . . .

With the death of his father in April 1820, the Rev. Arthur Young inherited the estate at Bradfield and thus became comparatively well off.¹ A letter by Mary Young, written to a friend in September 1820, quoted the following paragraph from a recent letter from her brother :

The precise time of my return is uncertain. In about three weeks I hope to quit this place. I go by sea to Constantinople : and view the plains of Troy, Smyrna, & the coast of Anatolia. I could have wished to extend my journey to Syria, Egypt, &c before visiting the south of Europe, but money will not permit all, if time would. So that, after examining the coast of Asia Minor & the Archipelago islands, I shall go to Athens, Morea, Corfou, & Malta : & from thence pass over to Sicily, & cross Italy and France to London.²

It may be conjectured therefore that the Rev. Arthur Young was back in England in 1821. It also seems probable, but not

ego zhizn' i tsarstvovanie, 2nd edn., 4 vols., St. Petersburg, 1904-5, iv. 102-4. I am indebted for this information to my colleague, Professor John C. Adams, who has also given me aid with the proper spelling of Russian words and names.

¹ Arthur Young's will, which I examined at Somerset House in 1938, is dated 5 February 1816. Everything went to Arthur except for a bequest to Mary consisting of a life lease on a cottage with some furniture for the cottage, about £2,000 in cash, and an annuity.

² N.Y. Public Library, Berg Collection, Burney Papers, Mary Young to Charlotte Barrett, 11 September 1820. Arthur's letter was dated 25 June, Old Style, from Karagoss.

certain, that he did not return to Russia until the year of his death, 1827.

In April 1827, he left England for a third trip to Russia and died in the Crimea on 24 September of the same year, shortly after reaching his estate. In the Bagshawe Muniments there is a fragment of a letter which is arranged as though it was a continuation of his letter to his father of 1818 regarding Way's visit. Examination makes it clear, however, that it is from another letter. From internal evidence it seems most likely that the letter was written to his sister Mary in 1827,¹ describing part of his trip back to the Crimea in that year. The fragment starts just as he crossed the boundary from Austria into Russia :

. . . the frontier line between these two great Empires & entered into Russia, or rather into Russian Poland. Much altercation and examination by the custom house officers on the Austrian side, this being the last place I have anything to do with these gentry. But on my arrival on the Russian side, the strictest examination of all my baggage took place. Even the papers of every sort in my writing case were overhauled, taken out & inspected, & to the letters I had for the governors of provinces in Russia, they affixed the post mark & made me pay the sum it would have cost to send them by the post . . . & then they delivered them back. The carpet bag was entirely emptied of the foul linen it contained, and the Inspector thrust his hands even into the boots. However as nothing contraband was found they were much disappointed, & not knowing how to delay my departure, before the rascal would give me in writing the general order for fresh post horses at every stage, they threatened to send me round the country for more than 200 miles out of my way, because I refused to bribe them. However I let them know in very plain language they might refuse me an order for post horses if they pleased, but that I should also in the meantime write to the Minister at Petersburg, & state to him that I was detained here because I did not choose to bribe them to let me go. After a general consultation . . . seeing that I was furnished with letters for people of the first consequence . . . they ceased their threats, gave me the order, & I reached the town of Radzivil at 2 in the afternoon, dined there & then set off at a gallop in a common Russian post waggon, having no top or cover, the whole machine with myself my baggage & the driver not weighing nearly so much as one the hind wheels of an English waggon. As I travelled nine hundred miles in these machines I will describe it. The fore wheels were about 2½ feet in diameter : the hind wheels 3 feet in diameter ; & the distance between fore & hind wheel 8 or 9 inches only . . . the body was

¹ The memorial plaque in the Bradfield Church, which gives the date of his death, includes the following : "In April 1827 he quitted England in full health, and crossing for the third time the continent of Europe. . . ." Too much is known about his first two trips, in 1805 and 1815, to make it possible for this fragment to be a description of either. Hence, if he made only three trips to Russia, this fragment must describe his third trip in 1827.

the shape of a small boat, having the two ends sawed off, composed of wicker work & the height of the whole concern on its wheels reached up to my navel. . . . When I was younger, I could easily jump over the whole, & can now jump into it with ease : the whole cost of a new one, 10^l/ English : about 6 feet in length & about 3½ to 4 feet broad ; & had no springs.

Nor a morsel of iron or a single nail in its construction, except the rims of the wheels : the model is at the Hall at Bradfield. In this little vehicle I laid my portmanteau, bag & new umbrella . . . a pillow of down I bought to set upon, to break the force of the extreme jumbling it occasions, & three horses being harnessed in ropes . . . I made a run, a long run, from Radzivil to Tulchin, changing horses & waggon every 10 to 15 miles, & travelling all night without ceasing, & I may almost say without eating as I took no other food than coffee & dry tasteless bread, & water when I was thirsty dry. It was a gallop of three hundred and fifty miles English ; for these two nights of course I never slept ; but the excessive jolting and rumbling of the machine almost overset me : the dust got so much into my eyes, that on arriving at Tulchin . . . I could scarcely see out of my eyes ; so covered with the black dust resembling a chimney sweeper rather than a traveller : & my legs swelled to the size of my thighs. Twas a constant gallop thro' a burning sun all day, but delightful weather at night. . . . I had some sound sleep at Tulchin after my arrival at the Jews inn : but some of the baggage is frittered to shreds. . . . It was a tremendous journey and the very people at the stations where horses & waggons were changed, seeing I paid the drivers well, & paid the post masters always with a bribe to hasten out fresh horses, & bring me the best, were surprized to find me travel in such a completely Russian manner, & asked me why I did not travel in a good carriage of my own. I told them to mind their own business & not mine—Through all this country at every 10 or a dozen miles, by the side of the road stands an immense crucifix 20 feet high, of painted wood to which (cut out in wood) is our blessed Saviour nailed to the cross. . . . The people as they pass by, take off their hats, cross themselves, & bow & pass on—These are the relics of Catholic superstition, & have not the slightest effect on the morals of the people.—The same evening I quitted Tulchin at 8 o'clock, & travelling all night, reached Balta at 8 the next morning. Wednesday 27th. Here of course I breakfasted, among the Jews, but as I got nearer to the Crimea I found good tea, but my sorrows were not ended, for the accident I am now to relate, I thought at the time would have been my last. . . . Providence ordered it otherwise, & extricated me from my perils, when all human aid was impossible. I was pursuing my course in the usual rapid style . . . when galloping down the descent of a hill, above a mile in length, tho' not very steep, the driver whipping his horses to keep them up to their full speed, they reared up, kicked against the front of the waggon & then ran away with the waggon. . . . In this dilemma the fore wheel took fire & smoked & blazed (all wooden axles) the horses were more alarmed, & encreased their pace, till the driver was thrown out in endeavouring to stop them. I held fast to the side, till the waggon came to the edge of the bank, the horses then turning suddenly to one side overthrew the machine in a moment, & galloped off trailing it after them : I was only bruised on my left arm & left shoulder. . . . The portmanteau & baggage great coat &c were scattered about, the driver was not much hurt but received a severe cut in the face from falling on a stone. . . .

Over all this country so productive in corn, the comb¹ of wheat sells on the spot for the price of 6⁹/ or thereabouts. . . . The wheat stacks in the different villages thro' which I passed stand unthreshed for the three last years. In some further up in the country five years wheat is in the stack, a prey to rats & mice. It is no unusual sight to see from 50 to 70 & even 100 stacks of wheat the property of one gentleman standing in long lines beside each other. . . . An extent of country much more than equal in size to the kingdom of England may be said to be now full of these stacks. Wheat in fact has no price here. Upon my own Estate here at Karagos my steward has a few stacks of small dimensions, altogether if threshed not amounting to 100 comb, for which no price can be had tho' close to the sea.

You may suppose what the fertility of the soil is when you are told that no dung is ever laid on the best land : where wood is cheap it remains piled up in heaps. . . . Where wood is scarce it is cut every summer into bits dried & burnt in winter instead of wood. Next day Thursday June 28th at ten² in the morning left Olviopol & arrived the same evening at Nicholayef. An Englishman governs this town, & several English officers are here in the Russian naval service it being a great naval station . . . & a Port of shipping. I cannot help remarking the usual employment of men women & children in picking the lice out of each others heads & frequently the children cracking them between their teeth. The boys & girls wallow in the sand and dirt before their houses cloathed only in a shirt or shift & covered all over with dirt. One of the English, an acquaintance of Mr^s Holderness & who came out to this country with the view of buying my Estate, now lies in the church yard of this place ! Woodcock ! He took to drinking, was always drunk & at last caught a putrid sore throat that he took no care to cure. Friday June 29th at 8 in the evening I left Nicholayef & next morning reached Boraslaaff after a run of ninety miles that night. I wanted something for my breakfast but could get

Thus abruptly ends the fragment. Poor Young ! in his comments on Woodcock he little dreamed that he himself would be dead in less than three months. The memorial in the Bradfield Church states that he had been in "full health" when he left England. The obituary notice in the *Gentleman's Magazine*³ declared that his death was "supposed to have been occasioned by the fatigue and exhaustion he experienced from travelling". Certainly the frantic and seemingly unnecessary

¹ The "comb" was a very common English dry measure equivalent to four bushels.

² The fact that 28 June occurred on Thursday in 1827 bears out the contention that this letter was written in that year. The next earliest date in which that day fell on a Thursday was 1821, but it seems likely that Young was returning to England in that year.

³ *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. xciii (1828), i, p. 274. The obituary notice also states that the entailed estate went to his sister, "the greater part of his other property he has left to two children, now infants".

haste which he described in his letter makes such a supposition reasonable. After all, he was fifty-six years old.

In conclusion, the Rev. Arthur Young remains an elusive figure, difficult to evaluate. A portrait would be helpful, but none has come to light. It is hard to deny that he was a failure, whether as husband, clergyman, or agriculturalist. Yet he was a man of considerable ability, great courage, and tremendous energy. Unfortunately much of his energy seems to have been misdirected and wasted. His difficult temperament was probably inherited from his mother and her family. He seems to have been consumed by an almost limitless ambition. He was so impatient to get things done that he did them badly. There was no inward peace in the man. He was always discontented. Worst of all, the Rev. Arthur Young lacked any real integrity. He was essentially an unprincipled adventurer.

CHILON AND AESCHINES :
A further consideration of Rylands Greek Papyrus
fr. 18

By D. M. LEAHY, M.A.

LECTURER IN GREEK AND LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF MANCHESTER

Col. i.

)οποις
το δε
)εν
}στων
ο)υκ οιδεν
) εαυτων
) κοινον
) τα ωφε
(λ), εις δε
)Σπαρ
(τ)εσ . . σ

Col. ii.

(. .) . . ταπ . . δια(βας εις την ηπειρον
(πο)λλην της παραλι 15 (as ν)πωρειας εκτισ(εν
Χιλων δε ο Λακων
εφορευσας και στατ(ηγη
σας Αναξανδριδη(ς τε
τας εν τοις Ελλ(ηδιν
τ(υρα)νηδας κατελυ
σα(ν). εν Σικυων(ι) μεν
Αι (σχ)ιηγη Ιππιαν δε
(Αθηνησιν) Πεισιστ(ρα
(τ

The above is the text as printed by Hunt in the *Catalogue of Greek Papyri*, i. 29 (Facsimile, Plate 6) in the John Rylands Library. A discussion of the text is there appended. The text as reconstructed by Hunt also appears in Jacoby, *F. Gr. Hist.* as No. 105, 1, and with the variant 'Ηπειρον' in l. 13 in Bilabel, *Die Kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus*, No. 1. (Unless otherwise stated, references to these three writers will be to their respective commentaries on this fragment.)

"A SMALL fragment containing the upper portions of two columns, written in a good-sized clear semi-cursive hand which can be assigned with security to the second century B.C., and with probability to the middle of the century. . . .

"Of the two columns partially remaining, the first, which has only a few letters from the end of the lines, is practically

useless, but the second, so far as it goes, is in a fair state of preservation, and is of an interesting, if tantalising nature. After an imperfect sentence (ll. 12-15) referring to the colonisation of a tract of country of doubtful identity, mention is made (ll. 16-21) of the Spartan ephor Chilon and the king Anaxandridas in connection with the suppression of the Greek tyrannies, amongst which those of Aeschines at Sicyon and Hippias at Athens are named. Unluckily the reading of this important passage is not quite certain."¹

This is Hunt's general description of the fragment which it is the purpose of the present article to consider; and his choice of the epithet "important" to characterize the latter part of it is readily justified by the number of times it has been cited as evidence by writers on sixth-century Peloponnesian history.² For, slight as it is, the fragment has considerable bearing on two major problems in that sphere—the development of Spartan policy and the chronology of the Sicyonian tyranny.

In the study of the policy pursued by Sparta in the critical but obscure period of her history which saw the rise of the Peloponnesian league, one of the chief landmarks is the commonplace of the ancient authorities that "The Spartans put down the tyrants"; but in fact the extant evidence for the several instances on which this generalization is based is extremely scanty. Thucydides merely records that the Spartans put down the tyrants of Athens and the older tyrannies of Greece (except for Sicily) not many years before Marathon:³ although Aristotle was completely acquainted with the facts he did not trouble to

¹ In expressing my gratitude to the various persons who have given me the benefit of their advice and answered my questions in connection with the present article, I trust that I may be permitted to mention especially Dr. F. Taylor, Keeper of Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, and Mr. C. H. Roberts, who guided me in the actual examination of the papyrus fragment; also a former colleague, Mr. A. J. Earp, who placed at my disposal a thesis on the Orthagorids. They are, of course, not to be regarded as necessarily agreeing with such conclusions as are reached in this article.

² E.g. Wade-Gery, *CAH*, iii. 568: Dickins in "The Growth of Spartan Policy", *JHS*, xxxii. 25-6; Ehrenberg, *Neugründer des Staates*, pp. 47-8; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*² i, no. 2, 279, 287; Schachermayer in *PW*, s.v. "Orthagoriden", col. 1432, Lippold, *ibid.* s.v. "Sikyon", col. 2357.

³ Thuc. I. 18, 1.

quote them, merely pointing to the Spartan policy in a general way as exemplifying his theory about the natural antipathy existing between aristocracies and tyrannies;¹ and to Isocrates it is simply a rhetorical *tópos*.² For a full list of the tyrants said to have been deposed there is no evidence other than that of Plutarch *De Malign. Herod.* 21,³ which gives a list of the nine cases, namely, the Cypselidae of Corinth, the same family in Ambracia, Lygdamis of Naxos, the Pisistratidae of Athens, Aeschines of Sicyon, Aules of Phocis, Symmachus of Thasos, Aristogenes of Miletus and Aristomedes and Angelus in Thessaly, the last being accredited to King Leotychidas.

The assumption that this list observes chronological order is, to say the least, not proven,⁴ and of the depositions mentioned only two cases (Athens and Thessaly) can be definitely substantiated by reference to other testimony—in each case that of Herodotus,⁵ with additional information as to the chronology for Athens in Thucydides and Aristotle.⁶ To these may be added the attempt to remove Polycrates,⁷ which is in fact the subject

¹ Arist. *Pol.*, 1312, 6.7

² Isoc. IV. 125.

³ There is indeed also the scholiast on Aeschines, II. 77, which includes the following: Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐπολιτεύσαντο ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ὡς προστάται καὶ κηδεμόνες τῶν πολέων. Ἀθηνῆθεν γὰρ ἐξέβαλον τοὺς Πεισιστρατίδας, ἐκ δὲ Νάξου Λύγδαμιν τύραννον, τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ Κλεισθενούς ἐκ Σικυώνος. The one additional piece of information afforded—that the tyranny put down at Sicyon was that of the house of Cleisthenes—is in any case assumed by most historians on the grounds of general probability: otherwise the authority of the scholiast on this point in itself is not great, since the general quality of the note is poor, dealing in vague plurals, obscure in thought (appearing under the lemma 'Αρμοστήν it seems to associate the deposition of tyrants with the installation of harmosts), and the whole bears the appearance of stock material clumsily incorporated into the commentary—circumstances which suggest a late date of compilation. The value of the evidence of this scholiast for the present purpose is thus almost negligible.

⁴ Cf. Wade-Gery, op. cit. p. 568, n. 1.

⁵ V. 63 ff. (Athens); VI. 72 (Thessaly). The latter attempt would seem, according to Herodotus, to have been only partially successful.

⁶ The deposition of Hippias occurred, according to Arist. *Const. Ath.* 19, 6, in the archonship of Harpactides, i.e. 511/10 B.C. (see Cadoux, "The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides", *JHS*, lxviii. 111-12). Thucydides' figure, twenty years before Marathon (VI. 59, 4), gives 510 B.C.

⁷ Her. III. 47 ff.

under discussion in this passage of the *De Malign. Herod.* The deposition of Lygdamis, though not actually attested, appears on grounds of general probability not unlikely.¹ The last cases, of Phocis, Thasos and Miletus, may most probably be referred to the period immediately after the defeat of Xerxes and so connected rather with the removal of pro-Persian rulers than with a doctrinaire opposition to tyranny as such,² but even the names of these three tyrants are otherwise unattested. Finally, the assertion that the Spartans deposed the Cypselid tyrants of Corinth and Ambracia is, to say the least, subject to doubts.³

The paucity of evidence for this important feature of Spartan policy is thus obvious : and in such circumstances the present fragment, slight though it is, is naturally of importance as being considerably older than Plutarch. This importance is, moreover, greatly enhanced by the fact that the fragment makes a significant addition to our information on the subject by attaching to the institution of the anti-tyrannical policy the name of Chilon, already known as a Wise Man and as an important figure in the constitutional development of Sparta,⁴ but not previously associated with innovations in foreign policy ; and it is therefore not surprising that the fragment has been so often cited as evidence for the history of Sparta in this period.

From the Sicyonian aspect the fragment has received perhaps even more attention than from the Spartan. The history of the Orthagorid dynasty at Sicyon presents a number of problems, not the least of them being that of chronology, in which two main schools of thought exist. The date of the deposition of Aeschines is of prime importance in this matter, and no other authority gives any direct indication of it. The present fragment has repeatedly been held to provide just this indication, but such

¹ How and Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus*, ii. 346 ; Parke, "Polycrates and Delos", *CQ*, xl. 105 ff.

² Though cf. v. Hiller in *PW*, s.v. "Thasos", col. 1314 (but no reasons given).

³ Spartan intervention is denied, e.g. by Wade-Gery, op. cit. p. 556 ; cf. also How and Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus*, II. 346.

⁴ Diog. Laert. I. 68 : καὶ πρῶτος εἰσηγήσατο ἔφόρους τοῖς βασιλεῦσι παραζευγνύναι.

is the peculiarity of its wording that it has in fact been cited by both sides in the controversy. It is not my purpose here to rehearse in detail the arguments adduced on the two sides; suffice it to state that the one school of thought,¹ relying on Pausanias' statement² that the second tyrant, Myron I, won an Olympic victory in 648 B.C., and on Aristotle's figure of 100 years for the duration of the tyranny,³ postulates a date near or somewhat before 550 B.C. for the fall of Aeschines, whilst the rival school,⁴ starting from the assertion of Herodotus that the anti-Dorian tribe-names endured for sixty years after the death of Cleisthenes,⁵ and taking this to imply that the tyranny itself continued for the same period, arrives at a date in the region of 510 B.C. In the latter case either Aristotle's figure is treated as inaccurate, or the correctness of Pausanias' statement is denied, or it is supposed that Aeschines was not an Orthagorid, the tyranny having been revived under a different dynasty.

It will thus be readily clear that *prima facie*, at least, the present fragment can be claimed as support for each of the two systems of chronology; for the traditional date of Chilon's ephorate, in Ol. 56 (i.e. 556-53),⁶ fits well with the earlier system, and the close association of the names of Aeschines and Hippias may seem to imply the later.

The importance of this fragment will thus be readily apparent, and accordingly I propose in what follows to re-examine it with the intention of ascertaining, as far as is possible, what testimony can in fact be extracted from it, and to what extent that testimony can be regarded as trustworthy. The latter problem in particular seems to me to have been neglected; for, despite repeated citation, there appears to have been no thorough-going examination of the soundness of the fragment as evidence; if one may

¹ E.g. Wade-Gery, op. cit. p. 550.

² VI. 19, 2.

³ Pol. 1315b, 11; cf. also Diod. Sic. VIII. 24.

⁴ E.g. Lippold, loc. cit. col. 2537; Schachermayer, loc. cit. col. 1432.

⁵ V. 68, 2.

⁶ D.L. I. 68, according to the original manuscript reading πεντηκόστην ἔκτην, restored by Jacoby ("Apollodorus Chronik", Ph. U. xvi. 183-4). Jacoby assumes that Ol. 56, 1 (i.e. 556 B.C.) is meant; Cadoux (op. cit. pp. 108-9), accepting this text, prefers 555 B.C.

judge from the tone of Dickins' remarks,¹ the age of the papyrus appears to have been taken as a guarantee of its worth. However, there are, as I hope to show, certain difficulties inherent in the text which must be faced if a true evaluation is to be made. As a result of this process I hope to determine what contribution this papyrus can make to our understanding of events in Sparta and Sicyon in the sixth century.

As a first step, it is necessary to form some idea of the nature of the work to which this fragment belongs. The general impression is of a very sketchy narrative, passing rapidly from one fact to another; thus the colonization of a mainland of uncertain identity is followed immediately by a single sentence, joined to the previous one merely by δέ and taking only fifteen words to credit Chilon and Anaxandridas with putting down the tyrants in Greece; whilst the juxtaposition of Hippias and Aeschines in brief parallel phrases apparently leaves no room at all for elaboration. Writing of this kind appears to me impossibly summary and disjointed for an actual work of history, biography or the like, and strongly suggests that what we have is in fact an epitome or series of notes on salient features of a fuller narrative. This supposition gains some support, I believe, from the fact that, as Hunt notes, the same writer has elsewhere been employed on a florilegium of poetry; the type of work involved is not so very different, when allowance is made for the difference in *genre*.

If we assume this to be the case, the next step must be to inquire into the identity of the source being followed; but in fact no definite answer appears possible, though the field may be limited to a certain degree. There is no clear indication in the text, and we are informed by Plutarch that the deposition of tyrants by Sparta was treated by a number of writers, none of whom he names.² The problem is not simplified by our inability to identify with certainty the subject of the participle διαβάσ or the scene of the operations to which reference is made in lines 12-14. It is perhaps possible that the work was a history

¹ "The papyrus is of the second century B.C. and therefore deserves respect." (Op. cit. p. 26.)

² περὶ ὧν ἐν ἄλλοις ἀκριβέστερον γεγράπται (op. cit. 21 D).

of Sparta, and that the reference at this point was to the colonization of Cyrene; some support might indeed be found for this in the appearance of $\Sigma\pi\alpha\rho$ in Col. i, but, as Hunt says, this reconstruction of the letters is doubtful, and in a history of Sparta the designation of Chilon as $\delta\Lambda\acute{a}k\omega\nu$ would be somewhat unlikely;¹ and, moreover, such an interpretation of the text would imply a large chronological gap between the subject-matter of the two parts of the second column. The chance that the fragment is taken from a history of Sparta is, I believe, remote; and indeed the possibility is not so much as discussed by the various editors.

Hunt and Bilabel, in their attempts to discover a connecting-link which will make the fragment represent a coherent work, suggest that we are dealing with a work on tyrants. The possibilities they offer for the subject-matter of lines 12-15 are the activities of Polycrates on the mainland of Asia Minor and those of one of the Cypselidae or an agent thereof in N.W. Greece. Of the two alternatives both editors prefer the latter, Bilabel going so far as to read *'Ηπειρον*—i.e. the proper name.

This in itself seems reasonable, for the founding of colonies in this area by the Cypselidae² is in general reconcilable with what we have here, but the lines have to be read in conjunction with what follows. Here Hunt sees a chronological difficulty in the implied gap between the activities of the Cypselidae in this region and the earliest possible date for the deposition of Aeschines. Bilabel denies that this difficulty is real, but I am inclined to feel with Hunt that the result is awkward. In particular it seems to me that in a work on tyrants a discussion of the Orthagoridae might well be expected to follow after one on

¹ The chance that the last word of line 16 was longer (i.e. $\Lambda\acute{a}k\omega\nu\omega\nu$) is in my opinion so remote that it can be dismissed at once. Even though $\Lambda\acute{a}k\omega\nu\omega\nu$ is not actually impossible in a work of this kind, $\Lambda\acute{a}k\omega\nu\omega\nu$ is much more normal in official titles. (Cf. Bölte in *PW*, s.v. "Sparta", cols. 1283-4). Further, a formal constitutional title is highly unlikely in conjunction with the second participle. Finally, the letters of $\Lambda\acute{a}k\omega\nu$ are written large and spread out as if it was the intention of the writer to make the short word fill the end part of the line.

² For a convenient summary of this, with references, cf. How and Wells, op. cit. ii. 341; also Wade-Gery, *CAH*, iii. 551-2.

the Cypselidae on the grounds that the great days of Cleisthenes, the greatest of the dynasty, belonged in a considerable measure to the period when the glory of the Corinthian tyranny, if not the tyranny itself, had passed away;¹ and moreover it would, I believe, be all the more natural for a discussion of the Sicyonian tyranny to be placed here in that the end of that tyranny is referred to in lines 16-22. I am thus somewhat doubtful about the suitability of this suggestion.

If one considers the other possible candidate mentioned by Hunt and Bilabel, Polycrates, a straightforward discussion of whether the choice involves an unlikely order of narration of the main events is here precluded by the fact that the deposition of Aeschines is itself one of the points at issue in this article, and the reign of Polycrates falls in the period between the alternative dates for that event. But there are, nevertheless, sufficient indications to enable us to doubt the suitability of Polycrates as a possible candidate without any danger of *petitio principii*. First is the consideration which led Hunt and Bilabel to this course—the unsuitability of *ἐκτισεν* as a description of the activities ascribed to Polycrates in Her. III. 39, 4. This is not in itself decisive; I shall have reason at a later stage to question the accuracy of the terminology of this fragment, and Jacoby does not rule out Polycrates as manifestly impossible on this score. Nevertheless, the argument is not without some weight.

In addition, it seems not unlikely that if Polycrates were the subject under discussion, one might expect a reference to the famous Spartan attempt to depose him to come between his

¹ This is the natural view of those who believe in the early date (i.e. c. 582 B.C.) for the fall of the Corinthian tyranny; so, e.g. Wade-Gery, op. cit. pp. 554-5. The summary of divergent views given by Schachermayer in *P-W*, s.v. "Periandros", col. 712, readily indicates the lack of agreement amongst modern scholars as to the accuracy of this dating, but the point at issue here is rather what date would have been accepted by a writer of the period to which the work represented by this fragment belongs; and it would appear from extant notices (e.g. Sosicrates of Rhodes, ap. D.L. I. 95 (on which cf. Jacoby, *Ph. U.* XVI. pp. 150 ff.); Diod. Sic. VII, fr. 7; Eusebius, *Chron. Ol.* xlvi) that, rightly or wrongly, the Hellenistic historians and chronographers, perhaps following Eratosthenes, (cf. H. R. V. Smith, "The Hearst Hydria", *Univ. California Publications in Classical Archaeology*, i, no. 10, pp. 255-6), accepted the early date as canonical.

achievements and an account of the successful Spartan moves against tyrants. That such a reference might actually have preceded the events discussed in lines 12-15 is the more unlikely in that the achievements of Polycrates on the mainland are clearly represented by Herodotus as prior to the Spartan attack, so that an involved chronology would be implied. It is, I suppose, possible that the main theme is Sparta and the tyrants, and that a reference to the attempt on Polycrates was followed by a mention of his achievements and that in turn by a discussion of other anti-tyrannical activities, but if so a somewhat involved construction must be implied, and the resumption of the main line of argument by the phraseology of lines 16-21 seems awkward, even for an epitomizing account ; one would rather have expected, if not a resuming statement to the effect that Polycrates was *not* put down, at least something like *τὰς ἄλλὰς τυραννίδας* (despite Jacoby's suggestion that *ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησι* might indicate a distinction between Polycrates and the others, I am myself more inclined to think that the appearance of this phrase is due simply to the commonplace nature of the general statement), and that the placing of Chilon and Anaxandridas at the beginning of the sentence is also a little awkward if this is the train of thought ; for it would have been a somewhat clearer connection had the *object* of the verb (i.e. the tyrannies, being the link with what had gone before) stood first.

The ascription to Polycrates is thus, I am inclined to believe, not very convincing.

The unsatisfactoriness of both these explanations is an additional reason for accepting as probable what is in itself a neat and attractive solution, namely, the suggestion of Jacoby that the work was one on the Seven Wise Men. He is led to make this suggestion by the striking prominence of Chilon's name placed before that of Anaxandridas ; according to this theory, the work would consist of a series of chapters, each beginning with the name of one of the Seven and containing an account of his activities. On this basis, the structure is simple, chronological difficulties recede, since there is no continuous history of a subject involved, and the ascription of lines 12-15 to Periander present no trouble, for he was regarded by many

as one of the Seven. Moreover, the description of Chilon as ὁ Λάκων is entirely appropriate in this case, and, indeed, much more so than it would be in a work on tyrants.

It is, I believe, possible to pursue the enquiry a little further. The few details which we have are all concerned with practical politics ; if we assume this fragment to represent an epitome, it is possible to suppose that this is because these aspects were picked out and others disregarded by the epitomist, but it is, I think, much more likely that they represent the general character of the work. Writings on the Lives of the Seven Wise Men appear to commence among the Peripatetics immediately after the death of Aristotle,¹ and are of a different character from the hotch-potch which appears, for example, in Diogenes Laertius, where unco-ordinated and even incompatible elements are thrown in together. The Lives of the Wise Men written in this period are related to the great controversy which raged amongst the successors of Aristotle as to the respective claims of the speculative and the practical life as the ideal for the philosopher, the various writers each seeking to demonstrate that the great men of the past had subscribed to the particular attitude which he himself favoured. The first and most famous exponent of the claims of the practical life in this controversy, Dicaearchus of Messene, is known to have written on the Lives of the Seven Wise Men, stressing this aspect of their characters ; such details as we have seem to preclude us from supposing the present fragment to be taken from his work, since amongst his six candidates for the last three places in the company of the Seven, if we may believe the testimony of Diogenes Laertius,² Chilon stood third, and Periander last, which would conflict with the presumed order followed in this fragment : but it is, I believe, not unlikely that we have preserved here something of a work belonging to this school of thought, and thus of a date somewhere between the beginning of the third century B.C.³ and the middle of the second when, according to the editors, the papyrus itself was written.

¹ Jaeger, *Aristotle*, App. II, esp. pp. 452-3.

² I.41. = FHG. Dicaearchus, fr. 28 (ii. 244).

³ His *floruit* not later than 310 B.C., cf. Martini. *PW*. s.v. col. 547.

This appears to be about as much as it is possible to state with any degree of confidence concerning the origins and nature of the narrative before us. As the next step, I propose to consider the actual text of the crucial lines which mention the activities of Chilon, and to seek to establish as exactly as possible what the correct reading is. There are two points at which greater certainty than is provided in Hunt's commentary appears to me attainable, namely, lines 17 and 21.

On the first of these, Hunt's note discourages the supposition that the mark over the *a* at the end of the line is a blot, though without finally precluding such an interpretation. The *στασιάσας* which he mentions would be a most attractive reading, well in accordance with what one can conjecture to have been the position in Sparta at the time, and free from any complications of a constitutional nature; it appears, however, that this reading must be definitely ruled out.

For, if one is to assume the mark over the *a* to be a blot, then it must be admitted that (i) its shape is remarkably like that of a *ρ*, (ii) its position is exactly where one would expect an inserted *ρ* to be. This is in itself to demand a double coincidence. In addition, one would also have to claim that the mark on the edge of the papyrus, where the letter after the *a* would have been is also a blot; for if it is part of a letter, the remains make it clear that the letter cannot have been a *σ* but may well have been a *τ*, the other possibility. The further coincidence thus required makes the supposition that the word should be *στασιάσας* practically untenable.

All remaining doubt is, however, dispelled by a closer examination of the mark over the *a*. For the downward line must be the tail of a *ρ*; it is a deliberate stroke of the pen, for it crosses the grain of the papyrus at right angles and does not spread along it as one would expect of a blot. Hence it is quite certain that, as Hunt himself believed, a word with a *στρατ-*base is required.

His note at this point is, "Hence *στρατ(ηγή)σας* or *στρατ(εύ)σας* is the most suitable reading: it may be connected with *Χίλων* as in the text, or, if the *τε* be dropped, with *Ἀναξανδρίδης*." This statement may best be considered by

taking its two parts separately, and for the sake of clarity, I propose to deal with the latter part first.

The question of whether the $\tau\epsilon$ should be dropped or not is one which cannot be settled by palaeographical considerations. Without the $\tau\epsilon$, the line would be short (fifteen letters) but not impossibly short ; the following line has only one more letter, and line 16 only thirteen letters. Admittedly the other short lines are followed by lines which begin with a long word, whereas if $\tau\epsilon$ be omitted the next word, $\tau\alpha\varsigma$, might possibly have fitted into its place, but this is not certain ; perhaps the three letters might not have fitted, and though the writer of the papyrus does break words he apparently carries at least a syllable over into the following line : so, even if we suppose the $\tau\epsilon$ to be omitted, it does not necessarily follow that the text of the fragment which we now possess would necessarily have been different. Thus no sound conclusions can be drawn from this type of fragment, and the decision whether to read $\tau\epsilon$ or not must be based upon the general sense of the passage.

If one omits it and connects the second participle with $\mathcal{A}ναξανδρίδης$, the resultant reading is a chiasmus, presumably designed to emphasize the parts played by the two men, Chilon being the politician who originated the project, Anaxandridas the military commander who put it into effect. Such an antithesis is, however, rather forced, requiring as it does a great deal to be read into $\epsilon\phi\sigma\pi\epsilon\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma$. And further, such a device of style seems foreign to the type of account under consideration, though perhaps this may be a somewhat bold judgement in view of the slightness of the fragment.¹ It is, however, supported by an examination of the second of the disputed readings mentioned above—l. 21.

Hunt's observations on this point are, "the termination of the verb (sc. $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\upsilon-$) is too doubtful to found any argument upon . . . Either $\sigma(a)\nu$ or $\sigma(\epsilon)\nu$ might be read". The caution of this statement seems, however, unduly great ; for the remnant of the letter following the σ strongly suggests that it cannot have been an a but can have been an ϵ , the only other possibility.

¹ The chiasmus in lines 21-3 seems, on the other hand, the sort of thing which might easily occur in summarizing a list of persons and places.

Thus we may assume that the verb was most probably singular. This fact, I feel, goes far towards ruling out the possibility of a chiasmus ; that a writer should include so stylistic a turn of phrase and then follow it immediately with a syntactical irregularity seems extremely unlikely.

We are, therefore, left with the conclusion that, for better or worse, the second participle, like the first, must agree with Chilon ; the reading (allowing for Hunt's alternatives) being

Xίλων δὲ ὁ Λάκων ἐφορεύσας καὶ στρατηγήσας (στρατεύσας),

'Αναξανδρίδης τέ, τὰς ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησι τυραννίδας κατέλυσεν.

There is admittedly still an irregularity of syntax, but it is a wholly natural one, for the second subject of the verb *κατέλυσεν* is introduced almost parenthetically, as if by an afterthought, since the writer was interested mainly in Chilon's part in the affair but wished to mention Anaxandridas, who also participated, for the sake of completeness.

This leaves us with the task of determining if possible what status or action is accredited to Chilon—i.e. in particular, what the correct reading for the second participle is. The two alternatives suggested by Hunt do indeed seem to exhaust the possibilities—there is no other word which will fit the remains of the papyrus and make good sense. Of the two it is to be assumed that he himself preferred *στρατηγήσας* since he incorporated it in his reconstruction of text ; and on the whole it seems perhaps the better reading.

There is indeed a *prima facie* case against this reading, on four counts. Firstly, the line must, whatever the reading, be the longest on the page (eighteen letters with *στρατεύσας*, nineteen with *στρατηγήσας*), so that the longer is on palaeographical grounds the less plausible ; secondly, the verb *στρατηγεῖν* normally means “to be general”, an office which is not attested at Sparta, even in the period when persons other than kings or regents were entrusted with military commands ;¹ thirdly, the tense of the participle is awkward.

¹ The term used in the earliest instances for a field commander other than a king is admittedly uncertain ; but in the latter part of the fifth century it was apparently ἀρμοστής (on this see Parke, “The Second Spartan empire”, *JHS*, I. 39, 49-50), and it seems not unlikely that this was the usage from the first.

The tense of participle normally used with this verb to denote status at the time of action is the present,¹ and so one would naturally expect *στρατήγησας* to imply "having been general". Now, to describe Chilon as "having been ephor" (*έφορεύσας*), though in my opinion presenting historical difficulties, is at least a sensible statement, for Chilon was noted for his ephorate, which marked an epoch in Spartan affairs, and thus to say that an action of his took place at a time subsequent thereto would be to add a significant piece of information. But no one, apparently, described the "generalship" of Chilon as marking a notable stage either in his career or in Spartan history (it would in fact be surprising if anyone did), so that the sort of time-indication implied by taking *στρατηγήσας* in the normal way seems very implausible. Alternatively, if one accepts this tradition as possible and allows that the two participles are intended only to indicate that two events in Chilon's career were over when he first took action against tyrants, the statement still falls between two stools; on the one hand, it is lacking in sufficient emphasis to give the fact such importance in the sentence as it might deserve—something like *ἡδη* would, I feel, be almost obligatory—and on the other, it is surprisingly prolix for a narrative otherwise so notable for lack of detail.

Finally, though I have admitted its possibility, is it really plausible that *έφορεύσας* is meant to convey "having been ephor?" Ehrenberg does indeed so take it;² but on the whole it seems to me unlikely. For, apart from the consideration of comparative lack of pertinence, referred to in the last paragraph, it must be stated that if Chilon did play a major part in promoting the anti-tyrannical policy (or, not to pre-judge the point at issue, if he was supposed by the historian being followed to have done so) it is difficult to see in what capacity this could be conceived

¹ Thus the aorist part. of *στρατηγεῖν* is never used by Thucydides except in the sense of "having been general" (cf. Van Essen, *Index Thucydideus*); in Herodotus two cases occur where the aorist part. refers to the status then held by the person concerned (cf. Powell, *Lexicon to Herodotus*). Of these, one (vii. 233) is readily explicable (cf. Goodwin's *Syntax of Greek Moods and Tenses*, paragraph 152). The other (v. 28) may be a genuine case of aorist with no difference from present. See below, n. 2, p. 421.

² Op. cit. 47.

as likely, if not as ephor. That Chilon afterwards became a member of the Gerousia is not in itself improbable,¹ but that such an office would allow him to be a driving force in Spartan foreign policy seems less probable ; and this supposition is less plausible for Chilon than for almost anyone else, for it was precisely his ephorate which was in later times recognized as marking an epoch in the balance of constitutional power at Sparta.

If, on the other hand, *στρατεύσας* be read, these difficulties are surmounted. The line is shorter ; the past tense is natural, since whatever the shade of meaning the verb denotes an action not a status, and describes the events leading up to the action represented by the main verb ; and a natural explanation of the difficult *έφορεύσας* appears. For since the aorist is so natural as to be virtually inevitable, it is quite possible to suppose that, though there is in this case no true parallelism between the ideas conveyed by the two verbs, he may have allowed the attraction *έφορεύσας καὶ στρατεύσας* to usurp the place of the more exact but less simple *έφορεύων καὶ στρατηγήσας*, though in fact meaning to assert that Chilon was at the time ephor. The cumulative force of these considerations would thus seem to build a not inconsiderable case for *στρατεύσας*.

Yet on the whole, when due account is made for the unelaborate nature of the fragment, the natural flow of the sentence seems to me decisive in favour of the other reading, for it creates a strong presumption of a second participle of such a kind that it balances the first in sense—i.e. one derived from a verb indicating a status, and this can only be *στρατηγήσας*. By contrast, despite all that can be said in its favour, *στρατεύσας* seems unbalanced and awkward. Against this flow of the sentence, the first arguments can have but little weight : it is not a practical impossibility to get nineteen letters into the line, and correctness of terminology is not always found even in the early writers.² The arguments against the meaning “ having been ephor and general ”, however, seem to me still valid, and one

¹ Cf. Alcidames (= Müller *Oratores Attici* XXIV. 5) ap. Arist. *Rhet.* II. 23.

² Note, e.g. Herodotus' use of *στρατηγῶν* of Leotychidas in VI. 71. Thucydides uses *ἡγεῖσθαι* in such cases. (E.g. II. 47, 2; III. 1, 1.)

must assume that though *στρατηγήσας* be read, the meaning of the participles is other than it would seem to be at first sight. Hunt translates the phrase as "having become ephor and general"—treating the usage as ingressive, which is very common with verbs of this type.¹ This gives a much more satisfactory meaning to the phrase and may very well be the correct explanation: alternatively, we may have here an instance of the aorist participle used without any regard for connotation of past time, as sometimes occurs elsewhere.² In either case the position ascribed to Chilon is that which he occupied at the time of his action against the tyrants, so that the phrase is pertinent. Whichever of these explanations be correct, it would appear that the only major obstacle to the reading *στρατηγήσας* can be satisfactorily removed, and I therefore tend to the view that, though *στρατεύσας* is not demonstrably impossible, *στρατηγήσας* is the more likely reading.

Since, however, much of the argument which is to follow will turn upon the second participle it will be advisable to show that the difficulties raised by the text cannot be avoided by adopting the variant reading; and I therefore proceed to consider whether *στρατεύσας* would in fact make any material difference to the sense of the text.

The verb *στρατεύειν* (in the active voice and with a singular object) most commonly means "to lead an army out on a campaign", the sense of "serve as a soldier" being normally expressed by the middle voice. That *στρατεύσας* might perhaps be meant to convey "having gone as a member of the army" (i.e. active for middle, perhaps by attraction from *ἔφορεύσας*), may not in itself be outside the bounds of possibility, but it is I believe ruled out by the immediate addition of *Ἀναξανδρίδης τε*. Even when one allows that the mention of the king is almost a casual one, the form of the sentence does strongly suggest that the status of the two men as regards the army is visualized as similar, and we must surely suppose Anaxandridas to have been fulfilling the normal function of a Spartan king and

¹ Cf. Goodwin, op. cit. sec. 55. For examples, cf. Kühner-Gerth. II. I, 155.

² Cf. e.g. Her. V. 28; *οὐτος μὲν τοσαῦτα ἔχεργάσατο στρατηγήσας*.

acting as a commander in the field. If this had not been what the writer wished to convey some other form of expression would surely have been essential, even in so slight an account as this. I therefore take the text, if *στρατεύσας* be read, to assert that Chilon led a force, together with Anaxandridas, to put down tyrants. And in fact, since *στρατήγησας* cannot, in view of Spartan usage, be regarded as denoting an actual title held by Chilon, there is no real difference of meaning between the two readings, on this point. Moreover, since it has been argued above that *έφορεύσας καὶ στρατηγήσας* can only be accepted as meaning that Chilon was both ephor and general, and similarly that with *στρατεύσας* the most reasonable assumption is that *έφορεύσας* would need to be explained as due to attraction, the meaning on this point also is identical. Thus, even were we to read *στρατεύσας*, it would make no difference whatever to the sense of the text, which must be "Chilon of Sparta, being ephor and leading an army, together with Anaxandridas, put down the tyrants amongst the Greeks".

It should be added, for the sake of completeness, that there is indeed one other way of reconstituting the text, which would give a considerably different sense. This is to drop the *τε*, substitute *ι* for *s* at the end of line 17, and translate *στρατεύσας* as "accompanying on the expedition", thus making the sentence refer to the practice of having ephors attend on the king in the field which is discussed in the Xenophontic Constitution of the Lacedaemonians¹ and is attested for the period of the Persian wars by a casual reference in Herodotus.² (This would, of course, avoid the objections raised above to *στρατεύσας*, as in this case the second participle also would denote the status of Chilon at the time of action.) If this reading could be accepted as correct, then much of the argument of the following pages would be unnecessary; but in fact it seems to me a highly unlikely reading.

That line 18 would be short is not a fatal argument; it would be only slightly shorter (by reason of ending in *ι* instead of *s*) than the "chiasmus" reading discussed above; the real difficulty lies in the construction of *στρατεύειν* with the dative. More accurately the phrase rendered as "accompanying on the

¹ XIII. 5.

² IX. 76, 3.

expedition" would be translated as "serving under", but this might well be near enough in an epitomizing account; it is the rarity of the construction itself which makes its appearance here so improbable. To date I have discovered only one instance, viz. Appian Civil Wars I, 42, and to suggest that this fragment, which in any case is considerably older than Appian, does preserve in these few lines traces of this rare construction seems to me to demand a degree of coincidence so great as to make it virtually impossible to believe in this reading. The meaning must, I feel certain, be what I indicated above.

To complete the discussion of the actual text, it remains to add a few words about the end of the papyrus—"ἐν Σικυωνίᾳ μὲν Ἀισχυνῆν Ἰππιαν δε Ἀθηνῆσιν Πεισιστράτοις . . ." The chance that *ἐν Σικυωνίᾳ μὲν* begins a new sentence appears slight; what indications there are suggest that the work was written as a continuous narrative, with the normal connecting particles, so that a new sentence here would require *γάρ* or something of the sort in addition to *μέν*. It appears to me almost certain that the construction of the sentence was such that the names of the tyrants put down in the different places were simply placed in the accusative in a loose opposition to *τυραννίδας* and that there was no further verb in the sentence; and even if there was originally another verb at the end of the sentence, no matter if other cities and tyrants were listed, it is difficult to see how it could have been other than something more or less synonymous with *κατέλυσεν* and redundant to the general sense.

The meaning of the relevant lines I therefore take to be "Chilon the Spartan, being an ephor, and leading an army, together with Anaxandridas, put down the tyrannies amongst the Greeks, Aeschines at Sicyon, Hippias the son of Peisistratus at Athens . . ."

This concludes the attempt to make clear the meaning of the text itself; I turn now to a consideration of the nature and value of the evidence it offers.

The first observation must necessarily be that, whatever else may be said about the fragment as thus elucidated, it can in no way support the later date for the deposition of Aeschines. To attempt to use it in this way is to incur major difficulties. For,

if one accepts the traditional date of Chilon's ephorate as approximately correct, *ἐφορεύσας* will have to bear the meaning "having been ephor", which is, as I have attempted to show above, very unlikely in the present context. Moreover, it will have to imply that not only was Chilon's action in respect of Sicyon after his ephorate, but that it was *forty years or more after it*, which is barely credible, even if we ignore as anachronistic the Herodotean story¹ which makes him advise Hippocrates, later the father of Peisistratus, against having a family. If, on the other hand, one keeps what I have suggested as the more likely sense of the participle and explains it by the supposition that the writer of the papyrus or the authority he is following held an unorthodox view as to the date of Chilon's ephorate, placing it near 510 B.C., the result is no better, for the association with Anaxandridas then becomes impossible. It is clear from Herodotus that not only was Anaxandridas not king in 510 B.C., but he had by that time been dead some years. The latest possible date for the accession of Cleomenes is c. 516 B.C.,² and c. 520 B.C. is more likely.³ If we are to suppose that whoever is responsible for the narrative under consideration did not realize this, we *ipso facto* reject him as an authority in chronology; if, on the other hand, we do him the credit of assuming him to have reckoned with Herodotus, as would be normal in an historian of any worth in the period to which I have suggested the narrative under consideration can be traced back, it becomes quite clear that he is certainly not favouring the later date for the deposition of Aeschines. For the death of Anaxandridas is so far distant from the end of the Athenian tyranny that any argument from the close association of the name of Aeschines and Hippias is practically valueless. Any serious attempt to substantiate the later chronology for the Orthagoridae must in my opinion abandon any hope of deriving support from the present fragment, and seek rather to deny that it has any historical worth whatsoever.

¹ I. 59, 2.

² Cf. e.g. VII. 148, which represents Cleomenes as being on the throne at the time of Maeandrius' appeal (i.e. c. 515 B.C.).

³ This is the latest date possible if that given by Thucydides (III. 68) for the Plataean affair (described in Her. VI. 108) be accepted. Cf. Beloch, op. cit. i. 1, 391, n. 2; Wells, *Studies in Herodotus*, 81-6.

This leads naturally to the question whether the fragment has in fact any such worth : and it must be immediately conceded that there are difficulties in the statements which it makes.

One difficulty is, I would suggest, apparent rather than real. This is the close association of the names of the two tyrants, which, if the text be taken literally, requires us to believe that Chilon and Anaxandridas put down both, a proposition manifestly incredible. The solution of this difficulty is to be found in the nature of the fragment itself ; for if the conjecture that what we have is an epitome of a fuller narrative is correct, it is not hard to suppose that the epitomist, in crediting Chilon and Anaxandridas with the inauguration of the anti-tyrannical policy by their action in the case of Aeschines, may have loosely ascribed to them the responsibility for later instances of the same policy at Athens and perhaps elsewhere, since the way in which the papyrus ends leaves open the possibility that there were other cases on the list. This point, then, need not be a major stumbling-block : the real difficulties arise when the evidence is considered in relation to the Spartan constitution, and they are three in number.

The first of these is that the text makes a man who is neither king nor regent a field commander, and there is no good evidence for such an appointment before the fifth century ; Parke¹ goes so far as to assert that non-royal commanders were unknown in early Sparta, and this is highly probable when the natural conservatism of Sparta is taken into account. There is one event which might perhaps at first sight suggest that such appointments did exist at least in the late sixth century, but in fact it is more probably an indication of the opposite state of affairs. This is the case of Anchimolius, who led the first Spartan expedition against Hippias.² The important fact about this case is that the attempt was made by sea, and it is not unlikely that Anchimolius was a navarch, this office being presumably as old an institution as the Spartan fleet itself.³ The fact that a sea attack was

¹ Op. cit. p. 38.

² Her. V. 62. 2.

³ i.e., at least as early as the expedition to Samos, 525 B.C. (cf. Her. III. 47), and, if Herodotus is to be trusted as to detail, as early as the fall of Sardis, c. 545 (I. 83).

preferred is curious ; certainly an overland one was possible almost immediately afterwards,¹ and one explanation which seems to me not unlikely is that the Spartan intention was to keep control of events out of the hands of the kings—which would at that time have meant virtually the hands of Cleomenes alone. If this was the aim, it would strongly suggest that a land expedition could take place only under the command of a king, even as late as 510 B.C. The first certain case of a non-royal person holding an independent command is that of Euainetos, who was sent to hold Tempe in 480 B.C.,² and indeed it is not improbable that this was actually the first time that the Spartans found it necessary to institute this type of command ; the lack of precedent may even perhaps be reflected in the tone of Herodotus' narrative at this point.

This denial of non-royal commands in early Sparta may on the face of it appear unwarranted in view of the often-repeated story of the " generalship " of Tyrtaeus in the Second Messenian war ; and admittedly if it should be established that he did hold the position of field commander at that time, the assertion that such appointments were unconstitutional must be considerably shaken, although it might still be argued that the crisis was so great that it called for extraordinary measures—as was indeed the case in 480 B.C.—and that an isolated instance such as this need not imply that this type of appointment became regular from then on. The evidence for the command of Tyrtaeus is, however, far from convincing.³

The story that he was an Athenian whom the Spartans at the bidding of Delphi made a fellow-citizen and entrusted with command against the Messenians is not traceable in literature earlier than the fourth century B.C. It was related with varying degrees of detail by Callisthenes and Philochorus, and is referred to by Lycurgus as being common knowledge ; Plato mentions

¹ Her. V. 64. 1.

² Her. VII. 173. 2.

³ The evidence for the " generalship " of Tyrtaeus ; *Strabo*, p. 362 (cf. esp. Kramer's edition, *ad. loc.*), *F. Gr. Hist.* 124, F. 24 (Callisthenes) and 328, F. 215-16 (Philocorus) ; Lycurgus, *Leocr.* 105 ff. Athenaeus, XIV. 630 ; *Diod. Sic.* VIII. 27, XV. 66 ; *Suda* s.v. See also Plato, *Laws*, 629A, and *Paus.* IV. 15, 3 ; 16, 1 ; 16, 3.

only his change of citizenship. The most general opinion now appears to be that his Athenian origin is a fiction.¹

Now the rejection of this part of the Tyrtaeus legend does not automatically entitle us to reject also that part which tells of his appointment to command a Spartan army; indeed the latter has even been cited as evidence for the improbability of his having been anything but a Spartan.² But at least we may look with some doubt upon such references as may be based on the "Athenian" legend; for, once having claimed the poet as their own, Attic writers would naturally be ready to ascribe to him as much importance as possible, and the tone of the poems might suggest a position of authority readily misinterpreted by patriots who were not well acquainted with the niceties of the early Spartan constitution. (This might, for example, be the case if the root of the whole legend is the reference to Tyrtaeus' Athenian birth in the *Laws*, which is certainly the earliest one known and may perhaps have been the outcome of one of Plato's peculiar ideas about early Greek history, on a par with his ascription of Theognis to Megara Hyblaea.³) One cannot, for example, absolve Diodorus from depending ultimately on this "Athenian" tradition, and the activities with which Tyrtaeus is credited in Pausanias' account of the second Messenian war⁴ are in all probability merely an attempt on the part of his authorities to add substance to the same tradition, which he himself obviously accepts.

There is in fact only one piece of testimony which suggests an independent authority for Tyrtaeus' command, and that is the passage in Strabo, p. 362. In this the writer, quoting Tyrtaeus as evidence for the dates of the two wars, speaks of the second as that in which the poet said that he had been a general (*ἥνικα φήσιν αὐτὸς στρατηγήσαι τὸν πόλεμον τοῖς Λακεδεμονίοις*). But even this testimony is not so good as might at first sight

¹ See e.g. refs. in art. by v. Blumenthal in *PW*, s.v. "Tyrtaeus", col. 1943-5.

² So, e.g. Bowra in *OCD*, s.v. and "Early Greek Elegists", pp. 40-1.

³ *Laws*, 630A.

⁴ He is never described as "general", and it is distinctly stated in 16. 1 that he took no active part in the battle of the Boar's Grave (IV. 16. 1); but in IV. 16. 3 he is described as enrolling Helots in regiments to replace the fallen.

appear. The text of Strabo is confused at this point, and there is probably a lacuna; one manuscript, however, adds that Tyrtaeus said this in the "Isonomia", which is presumably an error for "Eunomia". This being so, it is clear that neither the word *στρατηγός* nor any derivative thereof can have appeared in the text of Tyrtaeus, as the elegiac metre would not have permitted it. There must therefore have been some other phrase which Strabo interpreted as a statement by Tyrtaeus to the effect that he had held a field command. It is not metrically impossible that the original reading was *πολέμαρχος*; this would be a possible title historically, since it was applied at Sparta to a subordinate commander;¹ and might easily be taken as meaning something higher; but it seems more likely that if the reference was a personal one at all it merely employed a vague phrase appropriate to the position of prestige which Tyrtaeus certainly enjoyed, as the tone of his poems shows.² Such a reference Strabo, who was clearly acquainted with the tradition which said that he had been a commander, could then have readily misinterpreted. It may be added that in the very next sentence of the text as it now stands Strabo is guilty of taking a reference of Tyrtaeus to the coming of the Spartans *ἐξ Ἑρινεού* as an autobiographical statement concerning the poet's nationality. Thus one can hardly place great faith in Strabo as an interpreter of Tyrtaeus, and I would suggest that the evidence for the appointment of Tyrtaeus to anything in the nature of a field command is extremely poor, and can hardly weigh against the natural improbability of such a thing in seventh-century Sparta. The existence of a field commander who was neither king nor regent in mid-sixth century, as alleged by the present fragment, thus remains unsupported.

The second difficulty is this: what is to be made of the association of a non-royal personage as an equal with a king in

¹ Thuc. V. 66, 3; (Xen.) *Resp. Lac.* XI. 4.

² Thus his status would be somewhat analogous to that of the Elean seer Tisamenus (Her. IX. 33), who, though described by Herodotus as ἄμα Ἡρακλείδων τοῖσι βασιλεῦσι ἥγεμόνα τῶν πολεμῶν, was clearly not invested with any powers which would justify the description *στρατηγός*. (Cf. Macan and How and Wells, *ad loc.*)

command of an army? This is even more difficult to understand than the appointment of such a person to the sole command of an army. Appointments of the latter kind were in fact common enough in the later years of the fifth century, but not only is there no evidence for a commoner actually sharing the command with the king but it is difficult to conceive of circumstances where this might be expected to happen; the whole purpose of appointing "harmosts" lay in the need to provide commanders of forces where it was not possible or desirable for the king to take charge, and if the king was present, then *ipso facto* this need must cease to exist.¹ Thus the association of Chilon with Anaxandridas in command of an army is, to say the least, surprising.

Finally, there is the difficulty inherent in the phrase ἐφορεύσας καὶ στρατεύσας. I have already argued that if this phrase is to have any significance it must almost certainly be taken to mean that at the time of deposing Aeschines, Chilon was both ephor and field commander. Now this assertion, though apparently required by the general sense of the passage, is nevertheless from the constitutional aspect difficult to accept. Even if one tries to argue that only a subordinate command is intended—and, as has been maintained above, this is far from being the natural implication of the text—such an appointment is quite out of keeping with what we know of the character of the ephorate. For although the ephors had the duty of ordering expeditions (*փրουραν φάίνειν*)² they took no active part in them, their duties in the field being merely to advise the king if called upon by him to do so, and to continue their normal supervision of the behaviour of the citizen body.³ There seems to be no known case, if we except the one alleged in the papyrus under discussion, of military authority being exercised by a person actually holding the ephorate at the time. It is in fact clear that, at least

¹ Note especially the case of Dercylidas (*Xen. Hell.* III. 4. 6), who, although commanding an army in the field in Asia Minor before the arrival of Agesilaus with a separate force, was evidently reduced automatically to the status of a subordinate commander when the king commenced operations in the same area.

² For the probability that this function of the ephors was of very ancient origin cf. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta*, pp. 402-12.

³ (*Xen.*) *Resp. Lac.* XIII. 5; cf. Chrimes, op. cit. p. 403, n. 6.

in the period where adequate evidence for the constitutional arrangements of Sparta is available, the ephorate was essentially a civil office.

There are then these three difficulties in the text of the papyrus, and it seems that there is no comprehensive explanation which will clear them all away convincingly. It may indeed be the case that the appointment of persons other than royalty to military commands did begin at least seventy-five years earlier than the date suggested in this article ; again, it may be that the ephorate had in earlier times a military aspect which it subsequently lost ; but each of these propositions would need far more cogent evidence than is afforded by the present fragment before even a reasonable degree of probability could be admitted. And even so, it would be impossible to reconcile the two in one theory save on the assumption that the military aspect of the ephorate lasted just long enough to overlap with the introduction of independent commands and then died out, which seems particularly unconvincing. Finally, no explanation short of a complete breach of the constitution appears capable of explaining the alleged joint command.

There are in fact only two solutions which can at all reasonably be held. The first is that the prestige of Chilon was such that it enabled him to transgress the constitution to the extent of assuming a joint control of an army together with a king whilst serving as ephor ; and for so startling a departure from normal practice the evidence of this solitary fragment can afford scant justification. We are therefore thrown back on the alternative explanation, which is simply that the writer of the fragment did not in fact understand what he was asserting. This is, I feel sure, the true solution.

The facts as recorded are thus highly suspect, and raise in a crucial form the question whether any reliance whatsoever can be placed on the evidence of the fragment. In attempting to deal with this question, I would emphasize that the difficulties all arise from presence in the text of the second participle, *στρατηγήσας*, and this may be due simply to a misunderstanding of the authority being followed. If so, in the original form the statement would have made satisfactory sense historically, and only

ceased to do so as a result of garbled transmission. But even if we put the case at its worst, and suppose the papyrus to be merely repeating an error of the original, one must remember that the difficulties are all bound up with matters of Spartan constitutional practice, and that of a period several centuries before the time at which that work was composed ; and it is an open question whether, in a work of the kind on which I have suggested that the present fragment depends, one can reasonably expect accurate and detailed understanding of a constitution which, until a comparatively late stage in its development, was almost proverbially little-known outside its own state.¹ The knowledge which would be required is of a different order to that of the straightforward historical matter of the deposition of Aeschines, and by no means as essential to the writer.

If we set aside this particular statement (and of course the mention of Hippias discussed above), we are left with a reference to the ephorate of Chilon, King Anaxandridas, and the deposition of Aeschines. There is nothing in the association of these three ideas which is manifestly impossible : there is nothing self-contradictory about it. That the ephorate of Chilon fell in the reign of Anaxandridas is chronologically reasonable ;² that he should be involved in a major departure of Spartan policy is well in keeping with the tradition which represents him as raising the ephorate to a status rivalling the kingship ; and, as Hunt remarks, there may be some memory of this episode at the back of his appearance as a *μισοτύραννος* in Herodotus.³ Provided that we suppose the deposition of Aeschines to be dated correctly by the "early" chronology, the whole fits neatly into a pattern.

With this type of argument, a definite proof is impossible ; any attempt to manipulate the evidence to arrive at such would manifestly result in a circular argument ; but the fact that the evidence of this fragment and that adduced by the supporters of

¹ τῆς πολιτείας τὸ κρυπτόν : Thuc. V. 68. 2.

² The evidence available makes it probable that the accession of Anaxandridas is to be placed c. 560 B.C., cf. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*,² ii. 207 ; Wade-Gery, *CAH*, iii. 565-6.

³ Rivalling of kingship : D.L. I. 68 : *μισοτύραννος* : Her. I. 59. 2.

the "early" system of Orthagorid chronology appear mutually supporting creates a considerable presumption in favour of the correctness of both.

But one must face the possibility that the neatness of pattern is not due to the veracity of the statements, but to pure artifice. If anyone wished to invent details of Spartan sixth-century history, Chilon would be one of the few convenient names on which to hang them; his importance and reputed hatred of tyrants would make him a suitable protagonist for an affair such as is here described; and a little care could ensure that the "historian" did not obviously stultify his narrative by picking an impossible king to associate with Chilon. It is thus necessary to choose between these alternative explanations of the pattern displayed by the fragment.

Now, if it should be demonstrated on independent grounds and with a very high degree of probability that the deposition of Aeschines was late, I believe that the latter explanation would be tenable, and would justify the total rejection of this fragment as evidence—which, as I suggested above, would be necessary; particularly since the constitutional difficulties might in that case be cited as additional testimony against the worth of the papyrus. But in default of so clear a demonstration, I am myself inclined to accept the view that the neatness of the pattern is due to its veracity.

The details of the deposition of Aeschines appear neither in Herodotus nor in Thucydides, and in fact (despite later generalizations mentioning the end of the Sicyonian tyranny) do not seem to have caught the popular imagination as did, e.g. those of the disastrous Spartan attack on Tegea, around which circumstantial details of various kinds wove themselves in the period which separates Herodotus from Pausanias:¹ they fall on the contrary into precisely that class of comparatively obscure historical material which the research of the Peripatetic and Alexandrian type sought to recover.² That the scholars of this

¹ Contrast the accounts of the affair as they appear in Her. I. 66, and in Paus. III. 7. 3; VIII. 5. 9; VIII. 48. 4.

² It is, for example, highly probable in my opinion that the affair was described in the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Sicyonians*.

period were not always above inventing history is only too obvious, but at least in their fabrications "in character" concerning great men, if we leave aside the ascription of stock anecdotes of a general nature,¹ the tendency is rather to associate them with persons of similar importance (cf. e.g. the story of the tripod, which is intended to show a relation between the seven sages)² and when one has to decide whether a writer of this period has taken a given tradition (in this case the importance and the anti-tyrannical temperament of Chilon) and related it to an event whose details had never been considered of first-rate importance, or whether the pattern fits together because it describes what actually happened I would be inclined *ceteris paribus* to regard the latter as somewhat the more probable.

Thus, as far as concerns the Sicyonian problem, I would conclude that in default of a strong case to the contrary we have in this fragment a not wholly negligible piece of evidence, the earliest available on the subject of Aeschines' deposition, and coming from a type of source which can preserve good historical material, which tends to confirm the earlier date for that event, placing it in the ephorate of Chilon and relating it to the efforts of the latter.

To go further than this it is, I believe, to resort almost wholly to conjecture. In particular no attempt to reconstruct the episode from the Spartan side can command any great measure of confidence. The evidence would seem to me to warrant only the assumption that Chilon promoted the deposition of Aeschines, and that an army went under Anaxandridas to implement it. Whether Chilon, in addition to promoting the affair, actually went to Sicyon in person, and if so in what capacity must remain problematical. On purely *a priori* grounds it would seem not unlikely that he may have gone as one of the ephors attending on Anaxandridas in a formal capacity, since presumably two out of the five ephors of his year went, and as one of the duties to be performed was to advise the king if requested to do so, he would have been an obvious choice; but whether a purely formal

¹ Cf. Jaeger, op. cit. pp. 426-8.

² This dates at least from the *Tēpītōs* of Andron of Ephesus (F.H.G. II. 346).

attendance of this kind would be of sufficient note to be preserved in tradition and so handed down until it found a confused echo in the text before us is debatable. A special commission to help the king in the political settlement would be a far more likely thing to be so preserved, but for this I feel that the authority of the fragment under discussion is but poor. As I have attempted to show, the account which it presents gives us a garbled version of what are most probably historical facts ; and in such a case the simple facts that Chilon persuaded the Spartans to depose Aeschines and that Anaxandridas went with an army to do it may well have undergone a sufficiently violent process of misunderstanding and telescoping to produce the present text without the actual presence of Chilon at Sicyon ever being involved. Thus, whilst it might make it a little easier to explain the confusion if Chilon was originally represented as going to Sicyon in person, it would, I believe, be rash to rely on this fragment as evidence for such a state of affairs.

Nor, finally, is the fragment good evidence on the alleged Spartan deposition of the Cypselidae. The writer of the papyrus does indeed apparently regard the deposition of Aeschines as the prototype, which would seem, on chronological grounds, to preclude him from having supposed that the Cypselidae were amongst the tyrants put down, if the traditional dating be correct, no matter whether the list given in the papyrus continued after Hippias or not. But, if the papyrus represents, as I believe it does, a work of Dicaearchean tendencies on the Seven Wise Men, Periander would be the only member of the Cypselidae due for mention, and as he was certainly not deposed by the Spartans there is no reason why any mention of Spartan intervention at Corinth should have occurred in the work, so that silence on the subject is no indication either way : whereas the same writer, not having concerned himself with the fate of Periander's successors, but finding that Chilon was responsible for the deposition of Aeschines, may readily be supposed, in a work of this type, to have stressed the importance of Chilon's action by suggesting that it created the precedent for the famous Spartan crusade against the tyrants. This being so, nothing certain can be derived from the fragment on this point either.

I end by summarizing as briefly as possible, the conclusions of this long and somewhat involved argument. They are as follows :

1. The fragment appears to be part of an epitome or series of notes on a work, after the school of Dicaearchus, on the Seven Wise Men.
2. It dates the deposition of Aeschines to the ephorate of Chilon, thereby supporting the "early" chronology for the Orthagoridae.
3. The balance in favour of the veracity of the testimony of the fragment is, however, not so great that a convincing case on other grounds for the "late" chronology could not outweigh it and render the fragment historically worthless.
4. The fragment ascribes to Chilon an important part in promoting the affair, which also involved an army led by Anaxandridas.
5. On the exact details of the event, and in particular on the circumstances on the Spartan side, it can, however, have no guidance.
6. Nor can it be regarded as worthwhile evidence on the alleged Spartan deposition of Cypselidae.

THE LORD'S PRAYER : II¹

By T. W. MANSON, M.A., D.LITT., D.D., F.B.A.

RYLANDS PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND EXEGESIS IN
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

A YEAR ago I spoke on this subject in a Rylands Lecture, which has since been printed in the BULLETIN.² In that lecture I was mainly occupied with questions about the use of the prayer in the early Church and the extent to which this use for liturgical or catechetical purposes had modified its original form. As a result of the discussion it was possible to suggest that the earliest recoverable form of the Lord's Prayer was something like this :

Father, hallowed be thy name.
Thy kingdom come.
Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our bread for the coming day.
And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass
against us.
And lead us not into temptation ; but deliver us from the evil.

Today I should like to leave questions of textual, literary and historical criticism on one side, and consider the prayer as a religious exercise or "means of grace". I propose to ask what kind of religious belief is presupposed in the person who utters this prayer sincerely. What kind of God is it to whom this prayer can be addressed ? What kind of attitude towards God is to be engendered by the devout use of the prayer ? What hopes and desires are expressed in its petitions ? It is with such questions as these in mind that we are to study the text of the Lord's Prayer.

It begins "Father, hallowed be thy name". I think that the opening address, "Father", and the first petition, "Hallowed be thy name" are a single sentence, and that the full significance

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 7th of December 1955.

² BULLETIN, xxxviii (1955), pp. 99-113.

of it cannot be appreciated unless it is seen on the background of Jewish feeling and practice regarding the name of God. In the Decalogue the commandment was given, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain".¹ Jewish interpreters tended to understand the commandment as forbidding the indiscriminate use of the divine name to strengthen asseverations, even if the asseverations were in fact true. And that went with a deepening reverence which prohibited the use of the personal name of the God of Israel, except under special restrictions in the course of the Temple worship. One result of this reverence for the name of God was that in the reading of Scripture the so-called Tetragrammaton—YHWH, usually represented in our English versions by "the LORD", sometimes erroneously transliterated Jehovah—was never pronounced. Instead, the word *Adonai* was used; and it is this word that is rendered by "the LORD" in our Bibles. In the Synagogue *Adonai* was the perpetual surrogate for the divine name. The use of it, rather than the utterance of the Tetragrammaton, was one way of hallowing the name of God.

I suggest that in the opening words of the Lord's Prayer Jesus is putting forward a new surrogate for the Tetragrammaton, a new way of hallowing the name of God. Instead of saying "*Adonai*—Lord", his disciples are to say, "*Abba*—Father". On this change there are a number of things to be noted.

First is the fact that *Abba* was an expression in the commonest everyday use. It would be heard constantly in every family circle in Palestine, for it was the normal form of address by children to their fathers. It was as familiar as "Dad" in this country or "Papa" on the Continent. All over the world *Abba* and its equivalents are the natural expression of the trust and confidence of the child in his father, as well as of the filial respect due to the head of the family. And when Jesus tells his hearers that it is necessary to humble oneself and become like a child in order to enter the Kingdom of God,² he is not suggesting that

¹ Exod. xx. 7; Deut. v. 11; cf. Lev. xix. 12 and Strack-Billerbeck, *Komm.* i. 326 f.

² Mark x. 15; Matt. xviii. 3 f.; Luke xviii. 17.

the child is the possessor of virtues which his elders have lost, and that adults should take lessons in morality from their children. He is pointing to the plain fact that the child is dependent on his father and that in any decent family the relation between parent and child is that of care and protection on the one side and dependence and trust on the other. This means that the primary condition of entry into the Kingdom of God is total trust in God springing from a sense of total dependence upon him. The total love of God, which is required in the first and greatest commandment,¹ springs naturally from this trust and dependence.

At the same time this close and intimate affection, expressed in the word *Abba*, is not allowed to degenerate into cheap and easy familiarity. It is true that Jesus himself used the word in his prayers.² It is true that, as the Lord's Prayer itself witnesses, he meant his followers to use it in their prayers. It is true that in the earliest days of the Church the members did use it.³ It is also true that Jesus exercised a certain reserve in speaking about these matters. In the Synoptic Gospels what he has to say about God as Father is said to his disciples : it is not broadcast to the general public.⁴ This fact illuminates and is illuminated by the first clause of the Lord's Prayer, " May thy name be hallowed ". The name of God for the devout Jew was the ineffable name, for which he substituted the word Lord (*Adonai*). That name is still to be hallowed even when the new substitute Father (*Abba*) takes the place of Lord. The God who is addressed as " Father " is also Lord, " Lord of heaven and earth ",⁵ and the opening words of the Lord's Prayer speak in one breath of simple trust, confident love and deepest reverence. The God who is addressed in this way is the supreme Lord,

¹ Deut. vi. 4 ; Mark xii. 29 f.

² Mark xiv. 36 ; cf. Matt. xi. 25 ; Luke x. 21.

³ Rom. viii. 15 ; Gal. iv. 6. On the whole it seems probable that Gentile Christians in the earliest days were encouraged to use the Aramaic word *Abba*, even though it was a foreign word to them, perhaps because the example of Jesus himself sanctioned the use.

⁴ The evidence for this statement is set out in my book, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Ch. IV.

⁵ Matt. xi. 25 ; Luke x. 21.

before whose glory the angels veil their faces : he is also the Father who knows and cares for his children individually.

Next we have the double petition, " Thy kingdom come ; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven ". We may, I think, feel confident that these two clauses are closely linked together. Tertullian¹ thought otherwise and wished to interpret the coming of the Kingdom entirely in terms of the end of the world and the winding up of the existing order. But in order to carry through his interpretation he had to make an arbitrary inversion of the order of the petitions so that the doing of God's will on earth precedes the coming of the Kingdom. For such a change there is no manuscript authority whatever. I venture to think that Tertullian was wrong, and that the teaching of Jesus as a whole shows three distinct ways of looking at the Kingdom or Sovereignty of God. There is one sense in which it is eternal, a basic relation between the Creator and his creatures. It is simply there, and there is no more sense in asking whether it is past, present, or future than there is in asking whether the Fatherhood of God is past, present, or future. In another way of looking at it the Sovereignty of God, his kingly rule, is a present reality. It is something which men and women can receive, enter into, enjoy, here and now : and in two principal ways. First by experiencing its beneficent powers : " If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then surely the Kingdom of God has come upon you."² In other words, " If I by the power of God take men and women, set them on their feet, and enable them to have a life really worth living, that shows clearly that the Sovereignty of God is a present reality among you ". Secondly, the Sovereignty of God is experienced as a present reality where the Rule of God is accepted by the individual as his supreme loyalty. The teaching of Jesus is full of the unconditional claims which the present Kingdom makes on its subjects here and now. It is central to the Gospel account of the matter that the present Kingdom is closely identified with the person and work of Jesus the Messiah : his beneficent activities are the gifts of the Kingdom ; his claims on his followers are its demands.

¹ See BULLETIN, xxxviii (1955), pp. 108 f.

² Luke xi. 20 ; Matt. xii. 28. Cf. Luke x. 8-12.

The third way of looking at the Kingdom is concerned with a consummation that lies in the future. This consummation may be regarded as the final and complete victory of the Kingdom of God over the Kingdom of Satan. It marks the subjection of every will that is hostile to the will of God.

Which of these three senses is involved in the double petition, "Thy kingdom come ; Thy will be done on earth as in heaven ?" It seems to me that all three senses are present. The will of God that *is done* in heaven—one might almost say as a matter of course—is the eternal Sovereignty of God, which is shown by the order and regularity of the movements of the heavenly bodies¹ no less than by the implicit obedience of angels and archangels and all the company of heaven. The present Kingdom is implied in, "Thy will be done on earth", which, as the early Fathers were quick to realize and point out, meant, "Thy will be done for me and by me". The final consummation is implicit in the petition, "Thy Kingdom come". The real presence of the Kingdom here and now points forward to and requires a completion. The fact that in the present time some knees bow and some tongues confess inexorably demands the coming time when every knee shall bow and every tongue confess.

This interweaving of eternal, present, and future in a single religious experience can be illustrated by two observations. The first concerns the petition, "Thy Kingdom come". It is clear enough that when the Lord's Prayer was taken into liturgical use in the primitive Church, this petition was taken in with it. But strangely enough we have another petition in equally early use in the Church, a petition which says not, "Thy Kingdom come" but "Our Lord come". This petition appears in its original Aramaic form in St. Paul's first letter to the Corinthians,² as *Marana tha*, meaning, "Come, our Lord". It is implied in the prayer of the Seer in Revelation xxii. 20. It appears again in the eucharistic prayer in the *Didache* :³

¹ See for example Ps. xix ; *Psalms of Solomon*, xviii. 10-12.

² 1 Cor. xvi. 22. μαρανα θα = מַרְאֵנָה. This, I think, is the correct division of the letters. Cf. Dalman, *Gramm.*² 152, n. 3, 357, n. 1 ; Billerbeck, *Komm.* iii. 493 f. The alternative division *Maran atha*, "Our Lord is coming", established itself early. Cf. Wordsworth and White, *N.T. Latine*, ii. 278, *ad* 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

³ *Didache*, x. 5 f.

"Remember, Lord, thy Church to deliver it from all evil and to perfect it in thy love ; and gather it together from the four winds—even the Church which has been sanctified—into thy Kingdom which thou hast prepared for it ; for thine is the power and the glory for ever and ever. May grace come and may this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any man is holy, let him come ; if any man is not, let him repent. Marana tha. Amen."

It seems to me that we may put "Thy Kingdom come" and "Our Lord come" side by side in a kind of theological equation. Then we can say that the completed victory of the Lord Jesus is the same thing as the final consummation of the Kingdom of God. And "completed victory" in this context means what it says : as St. Paul says about the Risen Christ, "He must go on reigning till he has put all enemies under his feet".¹ The final consummation is the completion of something that is already really present ; the completed victory is the end of a campaign in which the decisive battle is already fought and won. There is genuine continuity between the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus and the final triumph of his cause.

We can go a step farther and say that the equation of the two petitions points to an equation of Christ and the Kingdom of God. We know that this equation was made by Origen when he used the word *αὐτοβασιλεία* of Christ ; and there is a real sense in which it is true to say that wherever Christ is, there is the Kingdom of God both in the beneficent power which it manifests and the absolute obedience which it demands. This truth is nowhere more clearly visible than when we put side by side the petition, "Thy will be done on earth as in heaven", and that other prayer in Gethsemane "Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee ; take away this cup from me. Nevertheless not what I will but what thou wilt".² That is the will of God done on earth as it is in heaven. And it is to be noted that when we come to the top level of obedience in God's Kingdom it is no longer a matter of detailed obedience to commandments in a Code of Laws ; it is not even loyalty to some lofty idea of conduct ; it is a personal relation, the total submission of will to will, total expendability in the service of the Heavenly King.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 25.

² Mark xiv. 36.

With that the first main part of the prayer is completed. It has been addressed to a God who exists in transcendent holiness, yet is near to his children ; whose presence means life and health and peace ; whose rule demands complete devotion and unhesitating obedience. He is a God who must be reverenced and obeyed : he is also, and first, a God who can be trusted and loved.

We now pass to the expression of man's dependence and trust in the requests made for provision to meet his most urgent needs.

The first is for daily bread, the material provision that is necessary for God's servants that they may carry on their daily tasks. It seems clear that the meaning of the Greek word translated "daily" is something like "for the coming day". The petition was put originally into the mouths of men who were accustomed to working by the day, and seldom having in hand enough money or food to cover their needs for a long time ahead. It is a prayer not for security but for sustenance : for a job to do tomorrow and the physical resources to do it. But we should misinterpret it if we narrowed it down to mean that we must all live from hand to mouth. It is legitimate, surely, that the obedience which undertakes a task that will last a month or a year should be able to pray for provision that will last as long as the task. What is desired is such freedom from anxiety as will enable the whole man to concentrate himself and his powers on the work that has to be done.

In this connexion it would be appropriate—and I can only mention the fact—to consider the bearing of this petition both on the practice of Jesus and his disciples, and on the community of goods practised by the first Christians in Jerusalem—and, so far as we know, by no other primitive Christian community. It is a fact that Jesus and his disciples seem to have sat very light to material possessions. When the disciples were sent out they were instructed to rely for food on the people to whom their mission was directed. Jesus was constantly guest in other people's houses. When he and the Twelve were in Jerusalem at the close of the ministry, and he needed a Roman denarius to make a point in an argument, he had to borrow it. The primitive

Church in Jerusalem, it would seem, adopted the practice of realizing the capital assets of individual members in order to provide for the daily needs of the community as a whole. There is matter here for closer study ; and I do not venture more than a suggestion. It is that, as Jesus sees it, all work that is respectable is and must be service. The motive behind the service is gratitude to God and man : " Freely you have received ; freely give." It must also be the response to human needs seen sympathetically. Such service is not a commodity to be bought and sold in the world's markets. It has no price. But those who give it have to live. What they receive is not payment but sustenance ; and the sustenance should be such as will enable them to do the best of which they are capable. Since ultimately all such service is rendered to the community as a whole, it is for the community to sustain those who render it. And that is as far as I dare to venture into the field of Christian Economics.

" Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us." I have little to add here to what I said in the previous lecture. The point that needs to be kept constantly in mind is that where forgiveness is concerned we are never confronted by a simple linear relation between God and man. It is always at least a triangle : God, my neighbour, and I. In the matter of sin and forgiveness, man never appears before God as an isolated individual, but always as man in society. His sins have repercussions on other people and other people's sins have repercussions on him. He appears before God linked up with his neighbours in countless ways. Any effective forgiveness must penetrate this barbed-wire entanglement of human estrangements and wrongs. And if it is to do so there must be wire-cutting on man's side as well as God's. So long as we remain completely hard and unforgiving, the barbed-wire entanglement remains impenetrable.¹

" Lead us not into temptation ; but deliver us from the evil." This petition has always caused great perplexity to devout souls. The question is asked, " But would God lead us into temptation ? " Is it consonant with what we believe about God to suppose that

¹ I would draw attention to some admirable remarks on forgiveness in E. Stauffer's *New Testament Theology*, p. 178.

he would expose us to such grave dangers? The early Fathers were well aware of the difficulty. Tertullian, for example, paraphrases and says the meaning is, "Do not allow us to be led into temptation, namely by him who tempts". That is, "Do not allow us to be tempted by the Devil". Ambrose says, "Do not allow us to be led into temptation . . . which we are not able to endure". Cyril of Jerusalem, on the other hand, argues that we must not seek to be exempt from temptation. This is shown by the following clause, "deliver us from the evil", which would be superfluous if "lead us not" meant total exemption from temptation.

There are two main questions which must be answered before we can be sure of the force of the petition as a whole. The first concerns the meaning of the word "temptation". As it is used nowadays it is practically confined to the one sense of outward enticement or inward urge to do something morally wrong. But the Greek word *πειρασμός* has a much wider range of meaning. It can mean temptation to do wrong; it can also, and quite commonly, mean "trial", "testing", especially the difficulties and dangers that may face the good man who is trying to do his duty to God and his neighbours. An excellent example of this meaning of the word is in Ecclesiasticus ii. 1 ff.

My son, if thou comest to serve the Lord,
Prepare thy soul for temptation (*εἰς πειρασμόν*).
Set thy heart aright, and constantly endure,
And make not haste in time of calamity.
Cleave unto him, and depart not,
That thou mayest be increased at thy latter end.
Accept whatsoever is brought upon thee,
And be longsuffering in varied humiliations.
For gold is tested by fire,
And acceptable men in the furnace of humiliation.

Here it is plain that what is called "temptation" is the whole mass resistance of the baser elements in mankind to the claims of God. This resistance shows itself in contempt for God's servants, opposition to them, open persecution of them; all of which is directed towards undermining their loyalty to God and breaking their resolve to obey his commands. The evidence of the Gospels supports this interpretation of the word. In the

explanation of the parable of the Sower, St. Mark (iv. 17) has "affliction or persecution" and St. Luke in the parallel passage (viii. 13) has "time of testing" (*πειρασμοῦ*). In Luke xxii. 28 Jesus says to the disciples, "You are the men who have stood by me in my trials" (*ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μού*), that is, in all the hardship and opposition in which his ministry has involved him. Again, at the moment when all the hostility of his enemies is coming to a head, he says to the disciples in Gethsemane, "pray that you may not come into testing" (*ἴνα μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν*),¹ where the meaning seems quite clearly to be, "pray that you may not have to bear the fiercest assaults of the enemy". This saying is particularly instructive because it comes so close in its wording to the petition of the Lord's Prayer, and because the whole story shows how Jesus meant a petition of this kind to be prayed. He had just done so; and his prayer had said two things: "Take away this cup", expressing the perfectly natural human revulsion against suffering and death; and "Not my will but thine", expressing unconditional loyalty and obedience to God.² We may conclude that "temptation" in the Lord's Prayer stands for those forces which would entice or drive God's servants into disloyalty to him; and since to fall into such disloyalty is to fall into the greatest misfortune possible, it is very right and proper that one should ask to be spared the trial. At the same time it is of the very nature of the case that he who prays this prayer should be ready and willing to undergo the trial, if need be, in the service of the Kingdom. In that event the second part of the petition, "Deliver us from the evil", appears in its full significance.

The Greek verb here translated "deliver" is commonly used in the Greek Old Testament to describe God's deliverance of his people either from personal enemies or from difficulties and perils. The idea conveyed by the word is that of being snatched out of present and pressing dangers rather than of being helped to evade them. The deliverer brings one through, not round, the place of peril. The classic statement of the matter is in the twenty-second Psalm, verses 4-8:

¹ Mark xiv. 38; Matt. xxvi. 41; Luke xxii. 46.

² Mark xiv. 36; Matt. xxvi. 39; Luke xxii. 42.

Our fathers trusted in thee :
 They trusted and thou didst deliver them.
 They cried unto thee, and were delivered :
 They trusted in thee, and were not ashamed.
 But I am a worm, and no man ;
 A reproach of men, and despised of the people.
 All they that see me laugh me to scorn :
 They shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying,
 Commit thyself unto the Lord ; let him deliver him :
 Let him deliver him, seeing he delighteth in him.

It is significant that in St. Matthew's account of the Crucifixion words from this passage are put into the mouth of those who mocked Jesus : "The chief priests, along with the scribes and elders, mocked him and said, 'He saved others ; himself he cannot save. King of Israel is he ? Let him come down now from the cross, and we will believe in him. He has put his trust in God ; let God deliver him now, if he is so fond of him : he certainly claimed to be God's son.' "¹

These passages—and many others—show plainly enough what is meant by deliverance, and who is the Deliverer. At the Crucifixion the deliverance did not come in the way suggested by the mocking bystanders ; but it did come ; and it came as victory, not escape. Victory over whom or what ?

This question brings us to the last of our problems of exegesis : is "the evil" in this petition to be understood as the evil one or the evil condition ? Grammatically both possibilities are open, and there is nothing in the actual wording to show which is intended. In the Church there has been no unanimity.² The Eastern Fathers generally construed the Greek words as masculine and understood the deliverance to be deliverance from the power of Satan. In the west Tertullian³ clearly understood "the evil" to mean the Devil. In Cyprian's comment on the clause⁴ the Devil is still prominent ; but we can discern the

¹ Matt. xxvii. 41 ff.

² For a full account and careful discussion of the evidence from the Bible texts, early versions, and early Fathers see F. H. Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church* (1891), pp. 71-176. Much of the early patristic comment is given in English in H. Smith, *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels*, ii (1926), pp. 270-80. See also Haussleiter in Hauck-Herzog *Realenc.* xx. 444 ; G. F. Diercks, *Tertullianus De Oratione* (1947), pp. 127 ff.

³ *De Oratione*, viii ; *de Fuga*, ii.

⁴ *De Oratione Dominica*, xxv-xxvii.

tendency to take "the evil" as referring to his hostile acts rather than to himself.¹ This tendency to make "the evil" refer to evil things rather than to their author gained ground in the West and became firmly fixed in the Authorised Version and the Book of Common Prayer. But the personal interpretation continued to be maintained ;² and it was adopted as first choice by the Revisers of 1881, the rendering "evil" being relegated to the margin in Matthew vi. 13 and to second place in the margin at Luke xi. 4. Which is right ?

If we consider only the dictionary meanings of the word *πονηρός*, there seem to be three possible interpretations of the clause :

- (a) *τοῦ πονηροῦ* is masculine and means the evil person *par excellence*, the Devil.
- (b) *τοῦ πονηροῦ* is neuter and means evil action.
- (c) *τοῦ πονηροῦ* is neuter and means misfortune.

Of these (c) may be left on one side as most unlikely. Looking at (b) two possibilities emerge : the evil action may be wrongs committed by him who prays or wrongs suffered by him. If we understand the petition to be for deliverance from the power of sin, we should have to understand *πειρασμός* in the preceding clause in the sense of moral temptation. But this, though possible, seems less likely than the trials to which the loyal servant of God is exposed. We should, therefore, understand that the primary reference is to the hostile attempts to frustrate the servants of God in their work for him and to detach them from his service. But hostile activities imply a hostile agent ; and deliverance from the threats and assaults of the enemy is deliverance from the enemy himself. Conversely, deliverance from the enemy is deliverance from his attacks. We may

¹ *De Oratione Dominica*. xxvii. "in nouissimo enim ponimus : sed libera nos a malo, comprehendentes aduersa cuncta quae contra nos in hoc mundo molitur inimicus, a quibus potest esse firma et fida tutela, si nos Deus liberet ?"

² See, for example, Suicer, *Thesaurus s.v. πονηρός* ; Grotius, *Annotationes in Libros Evangeliorum* (1641), p. 147 ; Calvin, *Harmonia* (1572), p. 91. Calvin allows that both the masculine and neuter interpretations are possible : the word "evil" may mean Satan or sin. He adds : "Nec de ea re mouendum est certamen : quia idem fere manet sensus, nos scilicet diabolo & peccato esse expositos nisi nos tueatur dominus & eripiat."

conclude that whether *τοῦ πονηροῦ* means "the Devil and all his works" or "the evil forces at work in the world and the will that lies behind them" is not in practice a question of very great moment. The whole petition says in effect to God: "If possible let us serve thee in peace and quietness; but keep us faithful, come what may."

So we may sum up the second part of the Lord's Prayer as asking for the means to do the work that falls to us, forgiveness for errors and failures in our duty to God and man, and protection against all that might lead us into complete dereliction of duty and apostasy from God. The God who is approached in these petitions is one who is able and willing to provide for the needs of his creatures; one who is always ready to welcome the true penitent, the penitent, that is, who has discovered that the basic evil of sin is that it estranges men from God and from each other and locks them up in the prison of their own selfishness; a God, finally, who is able and willing to defend his own and to give them victory over evil.

When we look at the Prayer as a whole, it points to a God who is to be loved, honoured, obeyed, and trusted in all circumstances. When we look at the ministry of Jesus we see the prayer prayed and the answer given; and it becomes plain that the best exposition of the Lord's Prayer is the life, death, and resurrection of him who taught it.

IBN ISHĀQ'S USE OF THE *ISNĀD*¹

By JAMES ROBSON, M.A., D.Litt., D.D.

PROFESSOR OF ARABIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

ALTHOUGH it became the practice in Muslim Tradition (*Hadīth*) to preface each tradition with a chain of authorities (*isnād*) through whom it was transmitted, it is generally recognized that *isnāds*, even in those collections of *Hadīth* which are considered to be the most reliable, are not to be taken at their face value. Most Western scholars would agree that there was a great development of *Hadīth* as time went on, and that *isnāds* had to be produced for all the material which had been amassed. How this was accomplished in a manner which proved satisfactory to the community need not be considered here. It is sufficient to notice that *isnāds* grew up in certain districts and within certain schools, following a course which was appropriate to the district and to the men who claimed to have received the traditions. In one sense this was dishonest, but in another sense it may be understood as a method of making explicit what those responsible felt that the course of transmission must have been. One may reasonably feel sure that by the time the recognized collections of *Hadīth* were compiled during the third century of Islām, their authors had no conception of the doubtful quality of the *isnāds* which they accepted as sound. They were honest men who believed in the genuineness of the transmission, a fact shown by the readiness with which they criticized *isnāds* which did not come up to their standards. It was recognized that different classes of people made use of the method of *Hadīth* in order to lend authority to their views, so *isnāds* were scrutinized and standards of judgement were developed. Where the critics fell short was in failing to recognize that even seemingly authoritative *isnāds* were as deserving of criticism as those on which they looked with suspicion.

¹ A shortened form of this paper was read at the 23rd International Congress of Orientalists held at Cambridge in August 1954.

It was said by some in the period before the canonical collections were compiled that traditions which dealt with the good life were not closely examined, but that those which dealt with legal ordinances were very carefully investigated.¹ Professor Schacht has, however, argued cogently that those very legal traditions do not go back to the Prophet as they purport to do, and he has suggested how they came to be developed and to receive their *isnâds*.² This is damaging criticism of the very class of traditions which were presumably accepted only after most careful scrutiny. He has brought forward arguments in support of his point of view which cannot be lightly rebutted, and therefore we may provisionally accept his argument as proved so far as legal traditions are concerned.

But suppose we agree that the main body of legal traditions is the result of development subsequent to the time of the Prophet and that the *isnâds* have been supplied at a later date to support them, are we justified in holding that the same principle applies to all traditions and to all *isnâds*? If *isnâds* came to be applied to legal traditions in the course of the second century, does it follow that *isnâds* were unknown before this? It seems better to infer that this development of fictitious *isnâds* was a copying of something which already existed with some degree or other of genuineness.

Horovitz, who has made important researches into the question of the *isnâd*, has concluded that the first introduction of *isnâds* into the literature of *Hadîth* was not later than the last third of the first century of Islâm.³ If that is accepted, one may surmise that the use of *isnâds* in oral transmission was earlier still. I do not suggest that from a very early date everyone who had information to impart was careful to trace his authority for it, a view which would be quite untenable; I would rather suggest that people who were anxious to collect accurate information about the beginnings of Islâm early began to inquire about the authenticity of the material transmitted to them.

¹ Cf. I. Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien* (2 vols., Halle a. S. (1888-90)), ii. 153 f.; J. Robson, *An introduction to the science of Tradition* (London, 1953), p. 11.

² *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford, 1950), pp. 138 ff.

³ *Der Islam*, viii (1918), 44.

In considering the question of the *isnād* it is inadvisable to start with the accepted collections of *Hadīth*, for they show the full development of the practice and are therefore not a suitable sphere in which to examine origins. Even the *musnad* works of Tayālisī (d. 203/818) and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) already show the *isnād* in fully developed form. Horovitz has reminded us that there are three sources for the sayings and doings of the Prophet, viz. *Hadīth* (Tradition), *Sīra* (Biography of the Prophet), and *Tafsīr* (Qur'ān Commentary), the ground-element in all being a pronouncement introduced by a chain of witnesses;¹ and Lammens has rightly insisted that *Sīra* and *Hadīth* are not distinct sources,² as did Horovitz.³ To consider the development of the *isnād* one should therefore go back to the earliest of these sources; so I propose to consider a few points relating to the use or lack of use of the *isnād* by Ibn Ishāq (d. 150/767, or 151/768) who presents us with what is presumably the earliest considerable source which we possess. It is true that we do not have the whole of his original work by itself, but his editor, Ibn Hishām (d. 218/834), seems to be very careful to distinguish what comes from Ibn Ishāq from what he has added himself. I shall therefore ignore the Ibn Hishām passages and pay attention only to material which is stated to come from Ibn Ishāq.

It is well known that Ibn Ishāq does not always use an *isnād* and that when he does so he uses it in different ways, sometimes being content to quote his immediate authority, sometimes going a little farther back, and sometimes going right back to a Companion of the Prophet, or to the Prophet himself. He commonly begins his treatment of some incident by a general statement of what happened without any authority being quoted, but this is merely his method of introducing the subject, for he usually goes on to give *isnāds* of various kinds for details of the incident, or to present different statements of what happened. It is worthy of note, however, that when he gives such important information as the names of men on both sides who were killed at the battles of Badr and Uhud, he cites no authority at all. One can only

¹ *Islamic Culture*, i (1927), 535.

² *Le berceau de l'Islam* (Rome, 1914), p. vii.

³ *Der Islam*, viii. 39 f.

suggest that details such as these were treated as being so well known and well authenticated that it was unnecessary to produce the evidence of an *isnād*.

There are times when Ibn Ishāq quotes vague authorities such as one of the learned, a man of the family of so and so, or a member of such and such a tribe. A fairly common practice is to quote one whom he does not suspect without stating who the man is. Why he does this is not clear, and it seems to be a fruitless task to attempt to discover the identity of the person. Wüstenfeld found this difficulty, and so far as I am aware no one since his time has been able to solve the problem. Only three times does Ibn Ishāq quote such a person without tracing his authority to some earlier source.¹ Four times the man whom he does not suspect quotes Ibn 'Abbās direct,² twice Abū Huraira,³ once 'Abdallāh b. Mas'ūd,⁴ once Ibn Abū Ḥadrād,⁵ and once Abū Sa'id al-Khudrī.⁶ Three times he quotes 'Ikrima from Ibn 'Abbās,⁷ as also Miqsam *maulā* of 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥārith from Ibn 'Abbās.⁸ Normally the man who is not suspected has one link between himself and the ultimate authority, but twice he has two.⁹ On two occasions, apart from when he is called one of Ibn Ishāq's friends, this man is specified, once as one of the people of learning¹⁰ and once as one of the men of Tayy.¹¹ There is one occasion where he comes second in the chain, where Ibn Ishāq cites 'Āṣim b. 'Umar b. Qatāda from one

¹ In quoting the *Sīra* I use W to indicate Wüstenfeld's edition (2 vols., Göttingen, 1859-60), and C to indicate the Cairo edition (4 vols., 1936) edited by Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibrāhim al-Ābyārī, and 'Abd al-Ḥafīz Shalabī. The passages referred to above are W. 378, C. ii, 195; W. 718, C. iii, 291; W. 947, C. iv, 224.

² W. 324, C. ii, 124; W. 368, C. ii, 183; W. 585, C. iii, 102; W. 789, C. iv, 12.

³ W. 673, C. iii, 230; W. 964, C. iv, 246.

⁴ W. 605, C. iii, 127.

⁵ W. 989, C. iv, 278.

⁶ W. 268, C. ii, 44.

⁷ W. 376, C. ii, 193; W. 428, C. ii, 258; W. 745, C. ii, 329.

⁸ W. 450, C. ii, 286 (*bis*); W. 585, C. iii, 102.

⁹ W. 756, C. iii, 343; W. 849, C. iv, 91.

¹⁰ W. 378, C. ii, 195.

¹¹ W. 947, C. iv, 224.

whom he (i.e. 'Āsim) does not suspect from 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz.¹

One may wonder why Ibn Ishāq is unwilling to name the man if he is so deserving of trust, and one may even become a little suspicious on noting that some of the stories told on this authority are extremely doubtful, if not impossible. For example, Salmān is reported to have spoken of someone he saw who appeared annually and cured the sick, and is told by the Prophet that if he is speaking the truth this was Jesus.² One who is not suspected is cited as authority for telling of the ladder coming down to Jerusalem to take the Prophet up to heaven,³ for the story of 'Ātika's vision giving warning to the people of Mecca of Muham-mad's attempt to waylay Abū Sufyān's caravan,⁴ for a statement about the badge of the angels at Badr,⁵ and for the statement that Badr was the only engagement in which angels fought.⁶ Equally remarkable is the story that Sa'd's body felt light when carried to burial although he was a fat man, and that the Prophet explained that angels were taking a share in carrying the bier.⁷ Other examples, however, contain details which are not inherently impossible. One wonders whether Ibn Ishāq included such anonymous people among his authorities because he did not really believe what they reported. That would suggest that when he called a man one whom he did not suspect, he really meant that he did suspect his information, whatever he may have thought about him in general. Whatever the reason, it does not seem to me to be reasonable to believe that Ibn Ishāq used such terminology when he had something to hide, for this does not agree with the general impression one gathers from his methods, despite what his detractors may have said about him.

His desire to tell only what he believes is shown by the way in which he frequently uses the root *za'am*. Goldziher drew attention to the manner in which this root is used to indicate an unfounded assertion.⁸ Ibn Ishāq obviously uses it to indicate

¹ W. 142 f., C. i, 236.

² Ibid.

³ W. 268, C. ii, 44.

⁴ W. 428, C. ii, 258.

⁵ W. 450, C. ii, 286.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ W. 698, C. iii, 263. Al-Hasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728) is the authority of the one who is not suspected, but the tradition is traced no farther back.

⁸ Op. cit., pp. 51 f.

either that he does not believe the statement he quotes, or that he preserves an open mind. It is striking how often it is used in the earlier portion of the *Sīra*, the very portion where one normally feels that the information is most likely to be legendary. Usually it is employed when there is no suggestion of an *isnād*, the people quoted normally being vaguely indicated by such terms as "they assert", "in what they assert", or "they asserted". While sometimes in later portions of the work the name of the person who made the assertion is mentioned, I have noticed only one such occurrence in the earliest portion.¹ It is used, for example, about 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib's vow when he dug the well Zamzam,² about Muḥammad's father 'Abdallāh being 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib's favourite son,³ about the light on 'Abdallāh's forehead before he had intercourse with Āmina and she gave birth to the Prophet,⁴ about Abū Tālib taking Muḥammad with him to Syria, on which occasion the monk Bahīrā recognized Muḥammad as the expected prophet,⁵ and about Maisara's story of two angels shading Muḥammad from the noonday heat on his second visit to Syria.⁶ Ibn Ishāq is obviously doubtful about the statement that Muḥammad described Abraham, Moses, and Jesus whom he met on his night journey, for he sets it down as the assertion of Zuhri on the authority of Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib.⁷ Incidentally, this is the only example I have noticed of the word *za'am* being used of one who can cite an authority for his statement. On another occasion Zuhri is credited with a mere assertion when he quotes a verse of poetry which he says Farwa b. 'Amir recited when he was about to be put to death by the Byzantines.⁸ Zuhri (d. 124/742), one of the most important transmitters of tradition, is Ibn Ishāq's most frequently cited authority, yet there are these two occasions where he suggests doubt about information he received from him.

Some of the statements called assertions are made by people who have some interest in the matter. For example, the B. al-Najjār asserted that As'ad b. Zurāra was the first to shake

¹ W. 112, C. i, 183.

² W. 97, C. i, 160.

³ W. 99, C. i, 162.

⁴ W. 100 f., C. i, 164.

⁵ W. 115 ff., C. i, 191 ff.

⁶ W. 120, C. i, 200.

⁷ W. 266, C. ii, 41.

⁸ W. 958, C. iv, 238.

hands at the 'Aqaba.¹ The B. 'Amr b. 'Auf asserted that the Prophet stayed among them more than four days at Qubā'.² The B. Sa'd asserted that the Prophet gave al-Shaimā' a slave of his called Makhlūf and a slave-girl and that she married them to one another.³ The B. Mālik asserted that one of them called Aus b. 'Auf killed 'Urwa b. Mas'ūd.⁴

At other times there is no obvious reason for calling a statement an assertion, as the incident in question is neither inherently doubtful, nor does it suggest that those who made it had a special interest. Ibn Ishāq evidently felt that such statements had not sufficient authority and he therefore called them assertions. Some incidents which he introduces as the assertion of people are of no great significance, and this very fact makes one feel that Ibn Ishāq is trying to be as careful as possible to avoid giving a false impression.

Another characteristic of Ibn Ishāq's is to finish a story or conflicting stories by adding that God knows best what happened. He uses the phrase in telling of Muḥammad's foster-mother losing him when bringing him to Mecca and of Waraqā and another man finding him;⁵ in giving different explanations of why 'Abbās explained to the people from Medina what allegiance to Muḥammad would involve;⁶ in relating different reports about the house in which Muḥammad lived in Qubā';⁷ in reporting how some said 'Ubaida b. al-Hārith was the first to receive a standard and how Ḥamza is said to have claimed to be the first;⁸ in reporting the claims of Nājiya b. Jundub and al-Barā' b. 'Āzib to have been the one to put the Prophet's arrow in the well at Hudaibiya, after which the water gushed forth;⁹ in reporting different stories about Musailima and the B. Ḥanifa deputation.¹⁰ The use of this phrase, sometimes when a statement is supported by an *isnād* and sometimes when it is not, shows that Ibn Ishāq was anxious to give as accurate an impression as possible and that therefore he did not always accept

¹ W. 300, C. ii, 89.

² W. 335, C. ii, 139.

³ W. 857, C. iv, 101.

⁴ W. 914, C. iv, 182.

⁵ W. 106 f., C. i, 176.

⁶ W. 300, C. ii, 89.

⁷ W. 335, C. ii, 138.

⁸ W. 418 f., C. ii, 245 f.

⁹ W. 742, C. iii, 324.

¹⁰ W. 946, C. iv, 222 f.

information without question, even when he had a chain of authority for it. His desire for accuracy is further illustrated when on two occasions he prays, before quoting words attributed to the Prophet, that he may be preserved from attributing to the Prophet words he did not utter.¹

Ibn Ishāq often uses such phrases as "in what has reached me", or "it was mentioned to me", perhaps because he felt the matter was common knowledge requiring no authentication, or perhaps simply because it did not strike him that it was necessary to produce authority for his statement. It is possible that when he uses such phrases he has forgotten where he received his information, but that is not so likely, because he often gives an *isnād* in such a way as to show that he is in some doubt regarding it, evidently with the purpose of making it plain that he cannot give as clear details as he would like. For example, he has an *isnād* in which he cites Jahm b. Abū Jahm from 'Abdallāh b. Ja'far, or from the one who told him from him.² Slightly different is the *isnād* where he cites 'Abdallāh b. Abū Najīḥ from 'Aṭā' and Muŷāhid, or from the one who related that.³ At times he is not sure of the identity of his immediate informant. For example, he quotes a statement attributed to 'Umar, but is not sure whether he heard it from Muŷammad b. Ja'far b. al-Zubair, or from Muŷammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abdallāh b. Huṣain.⁴ More commonly he mentions his immediate informant, but is not sure who is the authority at another stage of the *isnād*. He cites Yazīd b. 'Abdallāh from 'Aṭā' b. Yasār, or his brother Sulaimān, from Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī;⁵ and Yazīd b. Rūmān from 'Urwa, or another of the Learned.⁶ Four times he cites a *maulā* of Zaid b. Thābit from 'Ikrima, or Sa'īd b. Jubair, from Ibn 'Abbās.⁷ On the other hand, he once cites a learned man who transmitted

¹ W. 340, C. ii, 146; W. 344, C. ii, 150.

² W. 103, C. i, 171.

³ W. 227, C. i, 371.

⁴ W. 64, C. i, 103.

⁵ W. 964, C. iv, 246.

⁶ W. 272, C. ii, 51.

⁷ W. 371, C. ii, 186; W. 376, C. ii, 193; W. 545, C. iii, 50; W. 642, C. iii, 183.

some information from 'Ikrima and Sa'īd from Ibn 'Abbās.¹ A vaguer instance of similar doubt is illustrated when he quotes 'Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Hārith from a member of 'Umar's family, or a member of his own family.² Vaguer still is an example where he quotes a friend whom he does not suspect from Zaid b. Aslam from Rabī'a b. 'Ibād al-Dilī, or from the one from whom Abul Zinād related the story to him.³ It should be noted, however, that there is a variant reading which gives "and" for "or".

Two examples may be quoted of an unknown person occurring in the course of the *isnād*. Ibn Ishāq cites Sālih b. Kaisān from the one who told him from Sa'd b. Abū Waqqās; ⁴ and he cites a learned man from the one who told him from Muḥammad b. Ṭalha from 'Uthmān b. 'Abd al-Rahmān.⁵ It may be argued that such examples show that Ibn Ishāq had something to hide, but, from a consideration of his general methods, I prefer to assume that he gives his *isnād* in this way because he cannot remember the names of those whom he cites vaguely. The full system of always producing a completely connected *isnād* where everyone is named unequivocally and is known to be reliable had not developed by his time, so there was no reason for him to have recourse to a pretence of giving *isnāds* of unimpeachable authority. He therefore gave his information as he remembered it, and he is not to be blamed because he failed to come up to a standard which did not exist in his day.

The examples which have been quoted show how Ibn Ishāq is quite open about his methods. He does not claim that all the information he gives is of full authority, neither does he try to trace everything back to the Prophet. We may therefore be inclined to trust him when he does quote direct authorities and when he gives connected *isnāds*. His method of quoting his authorities varies. He has a large number of immediate authorities, some of whom he cites more often than others, the four most frequently cited being in order Zuhrī (d. 124/742), 'Abdallāh b. Abū Bakr (d. 135/752 or 130/747), 'Aṣim b. 'Umar

¹ W. 187, C. i, 315.

² W. 230, C. i, 375.

³ W. 282, C. ii, 64.

⁴ W. 576, C. iii, 91.

⁵ W. 998, C. iv, 290.

b. Qatāda (d. 129/746), and 'Abdallāh b. Abū Najīḥ (d. 131/748). They are sometimes cited without further *isnād*, sometimes in a composite *isnād*, sometimes quoting a Companion, and sometimes having an intermediate authority, or two such authorities, between themselves and the Companion to whom the tradition is traced. A few remarks regarding Zuhrī may serve to show how he uses his authorities.¹

While Zuhrī may appear at times as one of several authorities for a composite tradition, a method not unknown to Bukhārī whose *Ṣahīh* is commonly held to be the most reliable collection of Tradition, there are places where Ibn Ishāq, in the course of telling what he has heard, quotes him alone for some details. Zuhrī can also be represented as passing on his information from more than one man without distinguishing what he received from each. For example, in the story of the Lie about 'A'isha Ibn Ishāq quotes Zuhrī from four men, the same four being quoted as Zuhrī's authorities in Bukhārī, except that Ibn Ishāq gives Sa'īd b. Jubair and Bukhārī gives Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib.² The wording in both is very similar in stating how some remembered better than others. The chief difference is that Bukhārī says they got their information from 'A'isha, whereas Ibn Ishāq does not mention this.

While Ibn Ishāq quotes Zuhrī a number of times without tracing the information farther back, there are a number of instances where he quotes him only apparently without further authority. This may be illustrated in the account of Hudaibiya where frequently Ibn Ishāq merely says "Zuhrī said", and then gives a detail. But at the beginning he tells us that Zuhrī told him from 'Urwa from Miswar b. Makhrama and Marwān b. al-Hakam that they told him.³ When, therefore, he quotes Zuhrī eight different times in the course of the story without giving the source of his information, one may assume that the *isnād* given at the beginning covers all these instances.

¹ For a detailed consideration of the *isnāds* through Zuhrī reference should be made to the list of *isnāds* given by Wüstenfeld in his edition, supplemented by references in the Cairo edition. In Z.D.M.G., xliv, pp. 40 ff. Fischer has dealt with omissions in Wüstenfeld's lists.

² W. 731, C. iii, 309. Cf. Bukhārī, *Shahādāt*, 15.

³ W. 740, C. iii, 322.

Although Zuhrī is Ibn Ishāq's most commonly cited authority, there are a number of places where he quotes someone else who transmitted information to him from Zuhrī. Once he quotes 'Āsim from Zuhrī without further *isnād*,¹ and twice he quotes one whom he does not suspect from Zuhrī without further *isnād*.² Once he quotes Ya'qūb b. 'Utba from Zuhrī from Ibn Abū Ḥadrād,³ and twice he quotes him from Zuhrī from 'Ubaidallāh b. 'Abdallāh b. 'Utba from 'Ā'isha.⁴ Once he quotes Ṣalīḥ b. Kaisān from Zuhrī from 'Ubaidallāh from 'Ā'isha,⁵ and once without going beyond 'Ubaidallāh.⁶ In addition Ibn Ishāq once quotes one whom he does not suspect from Zuhrī from 'Urwa from 'Ā'isha.⁷

In considering such examples one must feel that Ibn Ishāq is presenting us with information as he received it. He does not attempt to trace it farther back than he is able, so he quotes Zuhrī alone if he has no further information, and gives an *isnād* if he knows of one. And he does not pretend to have received information direct from Zuhrī when he has received it from him at second hand. This produces an impression of trustworthiness, for Ibn Ishāq is obviously not trying to pretend to a greater degree of authority for his material than he possesses.

It may seem surprising that Ibn Ishāq has very few traditions from Nāfi' (d. 117/735) who appears so often in Mālik's *isnāds* in the *Muwaṭṭa'*. I have discovered only six instances,⁸ in five of which Ibn Ishāq cites him directly and in the other gets his information from him through Ṣalīḥ b. Kaisān. Each time Nāfi' cites 'Abdallāh b. 'Umar, twice tracing his information back to 'Umar and once to Ḥafṣa. In only two of these instances is there a corresponding tradition in the *Muwaṭṭa'*.⁹ I have counted sixty-five occasions when Mālik cites Nāfi' with an *isnād* back to the Prophet, but have not attempted to count the number of occasions when the *isnād* is not so complete. Why

¹ W. 676, C. iii, 234.

² W. 676, C. iii, 234; W. 750, C. iii, 335.

³ W. 837, C. iv, 77.

⁴ W. 1000, C. iv, 292; W. 1005, C. iv, 298.

⁵ W. 1021, C. iv, 315.

⁶ W. 776, C. iii, 367.

⁷ W. 731, C. iii, 309.

⁸ W. 229, C. i, 373; W. 319, C. ii, 118 f.; W. 395, C. ii, 215; W. 779, C. iii, 372; W. 878, C. iv, 133; W. 966, C. iv, 249.

⁹ *Hudūd*, 1, cf. W. 395; *Hajj*, 180, cf. W. 966.

should Ibn Ishāq quote Nāfi' so seldom when Mālik quotes him so often? We are told that Ibn Ishāq considered himself a greater authority than Mālik (d. 179/795) on traditions and that he asked for Mālik's traditions to be sent to him, calling himself their *vet*, by which he indicated that he considered himself more qualified than Mālik to judge of their value.¹ But because Ibn Ishāq cites Nāfi' so seldom, we are not justified in saying that he would have found fault with Mālik's numerous citations of him, even if he had been given the opportunity. Mālik's traditions from Nāfi' are almost entirely on purely legal matters, a subject which does not greatly concern Ibn Ishāq in the *Sīra*, for he is chiefly interested in recording events as such. It may quite well be that Nāfi' himself was chiefly interested in legal matters, and that therefore he was not a very useful source of information for Ibn Ishāq.

Going back to the generation before that of Nāfi' and Zuhri, we may note how 'Urwa b. al-Zubair (d. 94/712),² grandson of Abū Bakr the first Caliph, appears in Ibn Ishāq's *isnāds*. I have noticed forty-five occasions where 'Urwa appears, on twelve of which Ibn Ishāq gets his information through Zuhri. On twenty-one of the forty-five occasions the *isnād* is not traced back beyond 'Urwa. Six different men provide Ibn Ishāq with information in this way,³ but it is noteworthy that in other places each of these six men are cited as sources from whom Ibn Ishāq received information from 'Urwa with an *isnād* going farther back. To those who always wish to see a complete *isnād* this may appear to be unsatisfactory, but the very variation of method is rather an argument in favour of the genuineness of the way in which Ibn Ishāq quotes his authorities. Why, for example,

¹ Cf. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta'rikh Baghdād* (14 vols., Cairo, 1931), i, 223; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, No. 623.

² Although 94 is the favourite date given for 'Urwa's death, there is considerable doubt as to which year in the last decade of the first century he died. Cf. *Enc. of Islām*, iv, 1047; W. M. Watt, *Muhammad at Mecca* (Oxford, 1953), p. 180.

³ Hishām b. 'Urwa, Muhammad b. Ja'far b. al-Zubair, 'Umar b. 'Abdallāh b. 'Urwa, Yaḥyā b. 'Urwa, Yazid b. Rūmān, and Zuhri. In addition he gets one tradition each from Ṣāliḥ b. Kaisān, Ya'qūb b. 'Utba, and one whom he does not suspect, with *isnāds* through 'Urwa to 'Ā'iša.

should he sometimes cite Zuhrī from 'Urwa and at other times cite Zuhrī from 'Urwa from his aunt 'A'isha, if that was not simply the way in which he received the transmission? If it had been necessary, or even desirable, for him to provide a complete *isnād*, nothing would have been easier than to add 'A'isha's name each time. That he did not do so speaks well for his reliability.

Coming to the generation of the Companions of the Prophet, we may notice how Ibn Ishāq deals with Abū Huraira (d. c. 58/678) who is the most prolific source of traditions in *Hadīth* works. He appears in Ibn Ishāq's *isnāds* only twelve times, so far as I have discovered.¹ This indicates that Ibn Ishāq had ways and means of learning information which came from this source, and therefore we may not unjustifiably infer that he would have quoted more if a considerable supply had been available. There is no suggestion here that Abū Huraira was a prolific source of information, but there is clearly an indication that he must have transmitted something. Yet one cannot help noting that, while Abū Huraira is said to have come to Medina to accept Islām in the year 7 when the Prophet was at Khaibar, only four of the passages traced to him clearly date from this time onwards. It is true that four of the earlier passages relate to sayings of the Prophet which may possibly belong to a later time than their position in the text indicates, but there are others which can come from Abū Huraira only if he received his information from someone else who is not mentioned.

Ibn Ishāq as usual is careful regarding the manner in which he received his information. Once he quotes one whom he does not suspect direct from Abū Huraira, and once he quotes what reached him from Abū Sa'īd al-Maqburī from Abū Huraira without telling how it reached him. Normally Ibn Ishāq has two men in the *isnād* between himself and Abū Huraira, twice he has only one, and once he has a surprisingly long *isnād* in which he quotes Yazīd b. Abū Ḥabīb from Bukair b. 'Abdallāh

¹ W. 50 f., C. i, 78; W. 368, C. ii, 183; W. 393, C. ii, 213; W. 400, C. ii, 221; W. 468, C. ii, 312; W. 579, C. iii, 95; W. 586, C. iii, 104; W. 673, C. iii, 230; W. 765, C. iii, 353; W. 964, C. iv, 246; W. 996, C. iv, 287; W. 1012, C. iv, 305.

from Sulaimān b. Yasār from Abū Ishāq al-Dausī from Abū Huraira. As the incident recorded refers to an expedition evidently not long after the battle of Badr, an expedition in which Abū Huraira is represented as saying he was present, one wonders whether the story which has come through so many hands has not developed in the process.

On various grounds one has reason to question the genuineness of the vast volume of tradition traced to Abū Huraira¹ in the collections of *Hadith*, and this suspicion is strengthened by the fact that Ibn Ishāq quotes him so seldom. And even when Abū Huraira appears as the ultimate authority for items of information recorded by Ibn Ishāq, we may still have some doubts regarding what is recorded; but while that is so, there is no reason to doubt that what Ibn Ishāq does quote as coming from Abū Huraira reached him by the *isnāds* which he gives.

The impression one receives from a consideration of Ibn Ishāq's methods is that he is a reliable retailer of information as he had acquired it. It is obvious, as we know also from Mālik's practice in the *Muwatṭa'*, that in the first half of the second century the method of always using a complete *isnād* had not been developed. But it is equally obvious that *isnāds* of various types were in use, and from this we may infer that the practice of sometimes tracing authority right back to the event is earlier than the time of Ibn Ishāq.² Although the use of complete *isnāds* by Ibn Ishāq is far from being the rule, the very variety of his method gives ground for believing that he is supplying us with the types of authority available in his day. It has already been pointed out how he can cite an authority sometimes without support, sometimes going a stage farther back, and sometimes going back to a source contemporary with the event. When, for example, he quotes Zuhri sometimes with and sometimes without further authority, this can only mean that he

¹ Tayālīṣī has a moderate number of traditions in his *Musnad* traced to Abū Huraira, giving 303, Nos. 2296 to 2598. It is different when we come to the *Musnad* of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, for there we find 313 pages of Abū Huraira's traditions in vol. ii, pp. 228-541 (6 vol., Cairo, 1311/1895).

² For a discussion of early forms of *isnād*, apart from the work of Horovitz mentioned above, cf. Johann Fück, *Muhammad ibn Ishāq* (Frankfurt am Main, 1925), pp. 5 ff.

received his transmission of the material in this way. Accordingly, when *Zuhrī* is represented as receiving his information sometimes from an informant without further authority and sometimes with supporting authority back to the time of the event, this must mean that his informants passed on their material in these different ways. That a connected *isnād* back to the event is not always or even generally found does not justify us in doubting the genuineness of the early *isnāds* which we do possess in complete form; all it proves is that a complete *isnād* was not a *sine qua non* at the time. If Ibn Ishāq did not possess any complete *isnāds*, it is difficult to understand why he should sometimes pretend that he did, when his more usual practice is to do without them. Another matter to note in this connection is that Ibn Ishāq sometimes gives different *isnāds* through which he received different, or even contradictory, reports of an incident. This is perfectly understandable if the *isnāds* are genuine, for it is a commonplace to find different people giving different accounts of the same event, even where no personal interest is involved. Where some personal interest exists there is all the more reason to expect different accounts. So when we find *isnāds* produced to support the different views, their presence is best explained by accepting them as genuine.

If we agree that an early use of genuine *isnāds* going back to the event existed, the fact that this is far from being the rule naturally makes us question the genuineness of all the perfect *isnāds* which we find in works compiled in the third century. The examples adduced by Professor Schacht to show how many traditions which at one time did not have a complete *isnād* later acquired a perfect *isnād* cause one to entertain grave doubts; but while this is so, we are not justified in rejecting everything we find. We have seen that some perfect *isnāds* did exist at an early period, but we are not justified in concluding that they were the only ones. It does not necessarily follow that because later compilers produce *isnāds* on occasions where, for example, neither Ibn Ishāq nor Mālik uses them, they are all fictitious, although we may have our suspicions about most of them. If we agree that complete *isnāds* existed at an early period, it is reasonable to assume that men like Ibn Ishāq and Mālik either

did not make use of all the *isnāds* they knew, or that there were genuine *isnāds* in existence attached to items in which they were not particularly interested, or of which they were ignorant. It is not reasonable to make the assumption either that a scholar must be aware of every detail relevant to his studies, or that when he does not make use of some item of information he is ignorant of it. But while allowance is made for this, one cannot but feel that the vast majority of *isnāds* applied with such regularity in later times to all manner of traditions are fictitious.

My inclination is to accept as genuine lines of transmission the *isnāds* which go back from Ibn Ishāq to Companions or to the Prophet. But to go a stage farther and consider the nature of the information supplied with the supporting authority of these *isnāds* raises a very difficult question, for it is difficult for anyone to be completely objective in his criticism. It has often been suggested that, although the main body of Tradition cannot be genuine, there is a genuine core; but no one has yet provided a method of extracting this core. Yet if the transmission is accepted within limits, there must be a basis of fact in what is transmitted, even if it has undergone some process of moulding in the course of transmission. Whatever may be said about the development of legal traditions by later generations, and whatever doubts may be cast on the reliability of any information we have regarding the Prophet outside the Qur'ān, we must believe that we possess reliable information regarding the main outline of the Prophet's career, especially after the Hijra. Although we may not, apart from the Qur'ān, have Muhammad's actual words, we must have at least the general sense of what he said on different occasions. It may be that actual words of his have been handed down as nearly as it is possible to report words heard on important occasions. When one thinks of the phenomenal memories of the *rāwīs* who were able to recite great quantities of poetry, one is prepared to believe that there were people who were able to remember and repeat words spoken in conversation, or in more formal speeches. Granted that prose is more difficult to repeat accurately than poetry, we can still believe that there were people who could at least reproduce an approximately accurate representation of words which they had heard. But if we are to

determine with any degree of probability what the genuine core is, a study of *isnāds* is not in itself sufficient, whether we take into account all the numerous *isnāds* to be found in the canonical collections of *Hadīth*, or whether we confine our study to *isnāds* found only in the earliest works we possess. One must therefore combine with a study of *isnāds* some other approach.

Perhaps a suggestion of such a method may be found in the Form Criticism which has been applied to the Gospels. The position is certainly not quite the same, for in the Gospels as they stand we do not have the various elements of the sources separated out for us as we do through the *isnāds* of Muslim Tradition where, at least apparently, the transmission is traced back to the source. Further, New Testament scholars are by no means agreed about the value of the method of Form Criticism. I do not therefore suggest that an application of Form Criticism will solve all problems, but I do suggest that by an examination of the form in which different types of material are presented, with or without *isnāds*, it might be possible to come to some conclusion regarding the manner in which details relating to the Prophet came to be presented ; and we might, by studying particularly the material to be found in the earliest sources we possess, discover whether the reports of the Prophet's deeds and words had become modified or adapted at a comparatively early date.

It is only reasonable to believe that even as early as during the Prophet's lifetime he was a common topic of conversation, and that stories of what he said and did were eagerly discussed. With the expansion of Islām after his death there would be even greater reason for such conversations, for new converts would be anxious to learn all they could about him. In the material given by Ibn Hishām as coming from Ibn Ishāq we have our earliest considerable record of the Prophet's life. Can we, therefore, by confining our attention particularly to such a source as this come to some conclusion as to whether special forms of presenting the Prophet's words and deeds early developed through the need to make them known to succeeding generations ? Whether this would produce any appreciable result it is impossible to say. It is a type of research which might produce some useful result, but one cannot pronounce on its value until it is undertaken.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE STUDY OF JEWISH ICONOGRAPHY¹

By HELEN ROSENAU, DR.PHIL., PH.D.

LECTURER IN THE HISTORY OF ART IN THE UNIVERSITY OF
MANCHESTER

THIS study is divided into two parts : I. Cosmic Elements in the Haggadah of Sarayeo, and II. Architectural Tendencies and their Interpretation. Its object is an attempt to throw light on the development of Jewish Iconography. By "Jewish iconography" a type of relationship is implied which goes farther than that of mere copying of isolated forms which is universally found throughout the evolution of art. The question of formal priority cannot be a primary concern here since, in many instances, it is merely chance survival which affords knowledge of the relevant prototypes. Similarly, the individual work of a great artist, which cannot be regarded as expressing a typical attitude, has also to be excluded. The purpose of this study is rather to concentrate on a number of artistic themes which reveal the religious significance, and the impact on art, of the tradition of Judaism. A specific example will first be discussed, and then the scope extended in order to embrace more widespread but related themes.

I. *Cosmic Elements in the Haggadah of Sarayeo*

Of all the extant Jewish illuminated manuscripts, the Haggadah of Sarayeo is outstanding, not only for its elaborate ornamentation, but also for its full pictorial cycle and its artistic

¹ I wish to express my gratitude to the Jewish Claims Conference for a Fellowship Grant during the Session 1955-56. I also wish to thank the Authorities of the British Museum and the John Rylands Library for permission to study manuscripts in their possession ; Professor E. Robertson, Professor F. Wormald, and Professor C. M. Robertson for valuable suggestions and Dr. F. Taylor, Mr. A. C. Sewter, Dr. I. L. Gordon, Dr. M. F. Lyons, Dr. G. Zuntz, and Mr. C. J. Herington for bibliographical references. The History of Art Department and the Library of the University of Manchester kindly assisted in acquiring photographs and photostats.

quality. It has no fixed date, but can be assigned to the fourteenth century on stylistic grounds. It was connected with, or written in, Barcelona,¹ and is a fine example of the flourishing schools of Jewish illuminators of the period. The Days of Creation, forming part of the pictorial decoration, represent an unusual theme in a Jewish manuscript; furthermore, they are shown in a form unknown in Christian illumination. It therefore seems rewarding to describe the relevant folios and to enquire into the iconographic origin of the type.

The cycle is seen on two pages, which are sub-divided into four panels.² The First Day is represented by two miniatures forming the upper half of the picture, while the lower shows the Second and Third Days. The next page describes the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Days. The First Day represents the spirit of God as a flame on the waters and the contrast between darkness and light. In the following pictures, the globes of the earth are described according to the Old Testament with their appropriate details. Contrary to the usual iconography, the figure of God is omitted in order not to show the Creator, even though the representation of human beings was regarded as permissible in Jewish art. The Divine Presence is clarified and emphasised by rays and the universe suggested by planetary

¹ D. H. Müller and J. von Schlosser, *Die Haggadah von Sarajevo* (Vienna, 1898). A number of coloured reproductions are found in S. Radojcic, *Haggadah of Sarajevo* (Beograd, 1953), but no reference is here made to the Days of Creation. A good survey of references concerning pictorial representations is found in J. Leveen, *The Hebrew Bible in Art* (London, 1944), pp. 11 ff.

² J. J. Tikkanen, in *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae* (Helsingfors, xvii, 1889), *passim*. Also J. Strzygowski, *Orient oder Rom.* (Leipzig, 1901) and C. R. Morey, *Early Christian Art* (Princeton, 1941). J. Garber, *Wirkungen der fröhchristlichen Gemäldecyclen* (Berlin-Vienna, 1918); O. M. Dalton, *Byzantine Art and Archaeology* (Oxford, 1911) and *Early Christian Art* (Oxford, 1925); F. W. Deichmann, *Fröhchristliche Kirchen* (Basle, 1948). Cf. also D. C. Hesseling, *Miniatures de l'octoéque de Smyrne* (Leyden, 1909). J. Strzygowski in *Byzantinisches Archiv*, (Leipzig, 1899); P. Buberl, *Die illuminierten Handschriften in Steiermark* (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 17 ff., also pp. 152 f. *Die Byzantinischen Handschriften* (Leipzig, 1937), *passim*. H. Gerstinger, *Die Wiener Genesis* (Vienna, 1931); O. Demus, *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily* (London, 1949), especially with reference to iconography and chronology; cf. also Th. Ehrenstein, *Das Alte Testament im Bilde* (Berlin, 1923); O. Dalton, *East Christian Art* (Oxford, 1925).

spheres which form the upper regions of the illuminations of all but the first and last panels and the Sun and Moon found on the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Days. In one case only—the first illumination of the First Day—is the spirit of God represented by fire, as mentioned above. On the Seventh Day, when the Creation is completed, the rays are omitted and a male figure is seen, seated on a bench, resting in an aedicula with Gothic arches. According to the Byzantine tradition, as found in Palermo and Monreale, the prototype is the Creator resting;¹ but the Jewish Illuminator has transformed this into a Jew keeping the Sabbath, in order not to infringe on the pictorial prohibition concerning God. The contrary view, first suggested by Schlosser and almost universally accepted, is disproved by the elimination of the cosmic elements and the substitution of an intimate interior. Were Schlosser's theory correct, the whole series of pictures which so carefully avoids the Divine Image would be meaningless. This cycle of the Days of Creation in the Haggadah of Sarayeo appears, on a superficial consideration only, to be a secularisation of the theme, but careful study shows that it is meant to represent a spiritual and non-human interpretation of the effects of divine power, a type of interpretation familiar from Jewish representations of an architectural nature, the Heavenly Jerusalem, Babylon and the Temple.

¹ Cf. H. Rosenau, in *BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY*, xxxvi (1954), 468 ff. where bibliographical references may be found. M. Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos and its Art* (Oxford, 1938); H. Rosenau, *A Short History of Jewish Art* (London, 1948); J. Leveen, op. cit.; H. Rosenau in *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement* (1936), pp. 157 ff. C. Roth in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, xvi (1953), 24 ff. All these works include bibliographical references. C. Wendel, *Der Thoraschrein im Altertum*, Halle (1950), especially pp. 18 ff. This excellent study contains a specialized bibliography. Also F. Landsberger in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xx (1947), 227 ff. C. Orfali, *Capharnaüm et ses ruines* (Paris, 1922); also F. Landsberger, *A History of Jewish Art* (Cincinnati, 1946), p. 147 and *passim*. Sloane in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s. xxv. 1 ff. fails to recognize the Temple. For a convenient summary cf. Leveen, op. cit. pp. 2 ff. The most up-to-date work on the whole problem concerned is E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, Bollingen Foundation (Toronto, 1953), especially pp. 65 ff. On the possible relationship between the opening of *Genesis* and *Hesiod* cf. F. M. Cornford, *Principia Sapientiae* (Cambridge, 1952).

The first question which comes to mind in this context is whether a Jewish prototype existed for this cycle; but this is not so, as far as is known at present, although this lack of knowledge does not preclude the existence of kindred illuminations unfortunately destroyed. A manuscript which shows considerable Jewish pictorial influence—the Ashburnham Pentateuch, presumably of the seventh century—contains the cycle of the Days of Creation.¹ In it is found a sequence of illuminations, showing God the Creator, the earth being represented in a rectangular shape, and the inscription "terra" added in order to clarify the meaning. This interpretation may be based on the reference to the "four corners" or ends of the earth, found in Isa. xi. 12 and Ezek. vii. 2. Therefore a Jewish pictorial source may have existed, as it did for the more usual arrangement of the Temple and its fittings. The addition of the figure of God, on the other hand, must be derived from a Christian tradition, since it is alien to Jewish iconography which included no representation of the Diety except by inference from the symbol of the hand, as seen in the Dura paintings and the mosaics of Beth Alpha, of the third and sixth centuries respectively. These works reflect earlier traditions, as is shown in the similarity of the representations of the sacrifice of Isaac and of the Temple, the latter appearing prominently in the Ashburnham Pentateuch. It is therefore suggested that a Jewish prototype for the Days of Creation may have existed, but, if it did, it showed no similarity to the representations of the Haggadah of Sarayevo.

The question has now to be asked whether it was a Christian cycle which influenced this iconography. For this purpose the evolution of the type has to be considered. In this evolution four phases can be distinguished.

Since Early Christian examples have so far not been discovered, it may be assumed that the cycle was created in the fifth century, presumably due to St. Jerome's translation of the Bible, which familiarized a larger public with the text of the Old Testament. The earliest type, represented by the Cotton Bible, the Byzantine Octateuchs and the mosaics derived from

¹ Cf. note above and O. von Gebhardt, *The Miniatures of the Ashburnham Pentateuch* (London, 1883).

this prototype, shows the Creator within the Creation seen related to a naturalistic setting. These works express a continuous tradition, extending from the fifth century to the late Romanesque and Gothic periods.¹

The second phase, derived from the first, clearly reveals God or Christ as the Creator, since realistic details are eliminated and the scale of the Deity enhanced. To this type belong the Early Gothic *Bible Historiée* in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, (Pl. I), the Bible of Robert de Bello and the late thirteenth century French Bible (Add. MS. 38114) in the British Museum, and the Lothian Bible in the Pierpont Morgan Library, to quote only a few outstanding examples. The type is also reflected in the wall paintings of the Convent Church in Wienhausen in Lower Saxony, a fourteenth century work, following and adapting earlier prototypes. In the Bible of Robert de Bello and the Wienhausen paintings the Deity is seen beside the globe, whilst in the more usual type, represented in the other examples of manuscripts mentioned, God or Christ is shown holding or touching the globe. These gestures are based on Hellenistic and Roman traditions of iconography, expressing the rulers' supporting power.² The globe itself is described according to the Book of Genesis, showing minor variations of detail, but

¹ Cf. p. 467, n. 2. No influence from Early Christian Sarcophagi can be traced. Cf. F. Gerke, *Die christlichen Sarkophage* (Berlin, 1940). On the iconography of the Roman emperors cf. J. Charbonneau, *L'art au siècle d'Auguste* (Lausanne, 1948), pp. 78 ff. Also "Globus" in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*.

² R. Fawtier, *La bible historiée . . . de la John Rylands Library* (Paris, 1924). E. G. Millar, *English Illuminated Manuscripts* (Paris and Brussels, 1926), *passim*, and in *Souvenir de l'exposition de manuscrits français à peintures organisée à la Grenville Library*, British Museum (1932-3), p. 19, Pl. XII, reproducing fol. v.; *The Pierpont Morgan Library Review* (1930-5), *passim*. Cf. also note above, and especially G. Bovini, *I Sarcophagi Paleocristiani*, *Città del Vaticano* (1949), *passim*, is particularly valuable, because here a survey is made of the dated monuments. K. Weitzmann in *Münchner Jahrbuch für Bildende Kunst* (1954), pp. 96 ff. and in *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honour of A. M. Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1955), pp. 112 ff. W. Pächt and A. Grabar in *Cahiers Archéologiques* (Paris, 1954), pp. 35 ff. and 171 ff. respectively. I owe this reference to Dr. O. Buchthal. Also A. Shapiro in *Gazette des Beaux Arts* (1952), pp. 27 ff. It is worth noting that the presumably Christian mosaic floor in the basilica of Aquileia lays emphasis on the Jonah story.

Je crée le ciel et la terre et le premier homme.



PL. I.—Christ as Creator. From a *Bible Historiée*.
(Rylands French MS. 5, f. lv).



PL. II.—The Messianic Temple. From the Haggadah of Sarayevo.
(National Museum, Sarayevo, f. xxxii of full-page illuminations).

repeating the more essential elements, the earth, water, sky and clouds. It is worth noting that the three first Days of Creation are combined in two illuminations in the Rylands *Bible Historiée*, an uncommon feature since, although combinations of scenes are frequent in medieval illustrations, this cycle usually appears in an unabridged form. Stranger still, the sixth Day is entirely absent.

During the next phase, mainly in the fourteenth century, the Gothic prototypes were adapted in a variety of ways in the sense of secularization or of personal mysticism, or, to put it in another way, the substitution of an hieratic form by an individualized type takes place. It is at this period that the taking over of the Christian prototype by the Jewish illuminator can be expected.

Lastly, Michelangelo's interpretation of the Creation in the Sistine Chapel creates a novel form in which the human figure is emphasized against a background of barren rock or cloud formations. This type and those derived from it play no part in our present study, since they are later than the Haggadah concerned.¹

When considering the Days of Creation of the Haggadah of Sarayeo in the light of the evolution just outlined, it is apparent that the Jewish illuminator adapted the Gothic prototype by eliminating the figure of the Creator, in this way strengthening the cosmic elements in the scenes described.

A similar interpretation is seen in the closed vollets of Jerome Bosch's *Millennium*, now in the Prado Museum in Madrid. These show in grisaille the lower half of the earth, revealing plants and the encircling sea, the upper half representing the sky as typical of the iconography of the Third Day; although the inscription "Ipse dixit et facta sunt; ipse mandavit et creata sunt" (Psalm xxxiii. 9) refers to the Creation in general. The earth is not shown as a globe, but as a planisphere, contrary to the suggestion of Fränger, who assumes that sensual forces of the underworld are indicated in the lower portion of the picture.²

¹ R. Todd, *Tracks in the Snow* (London, 1946). Fig. 13 shows a design by Blake representing God in the Michelangelesque tradition.

² W. Fränger, *The Millennium of H. Bosch* (London, 1952), pp. 32 ff. and Ch. de Tolnay, *H. Bosch* (Basle, 1937), especially p. 34. The picture has been examined for the writer by the authorities of the Prado and by Dr. J. Gonzalez Muela.

Indeed, there is no reason to suppose that Bosch followed the pre-Ptolemaic, so-called "Homeric" tradition, since it is well known and clear from the subject here discussed, that the Middle Ages were familiar with the global form of the earth. As in so many of his other paintings, Bosch thus reveals himself as a continuator of medieval thought rather than the precursor of a modern age. To see in these vollets a picture of pure landscape, as suggested by Tolnay, is therefore misleading—a fact which is underlined by the retention of the small figure of the Creator, almost like an afterthought, in the top left-hand corner of the painting. The emphasis on the isolated globe achieves an effect similar to the series in the Haggadah of Sarayevo, and indeed Jewish pictorial sources and religious influences may well play a part in Bosch's outlook and oeuvre. This may well have been particularly apparent in the altar of the Cathedral of St. John in s'Hertogenbosch, which had as its theme the Seven Days of Creation.¹

It may be useful to compare the Days of Creation in the Haggadah of Sarayevo with two characteristic examples of the same period in order to clarify better its place in iconographic development. In this context the illumination of the frontispiece of the manuscript of John Gower's "Vox Clamantis" in the British Museum and the altar of the Church of St. Peter in Hamburg should be considered.

In the former manuscript and others derived from it John Gower is shown shooting at the world. The world is represented as a globe, divided into two halves, the lower representing the sea and the upper sub-divided into earth and sky, according to the astronomical tradition of the time as seen, for example, in Gossouin's *Image du Monde*, similarly

¹ On Jewish influences on Christian sects cf. B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1952). A specialized and detailed study of the influence of Jewish thought on Bosch may well be rewarding. His knowledge of the Old Testament is clear; he could have derived it from Jewish sources. A connection with Jewish legends is found in an article on Bosch by L. Brand Philip in the *Art Bulletin*, xxxv, 1953, p. 267 ff. which is based on written sources and therefore corroborates our findings with regard to iconographic sources. Professor E. Panofsky kindly drew the writer's attention to this publication after the completion of this study.

found in Wienhausen.¹ The earth is characterized by vegetation, the sky by clouds. It is clear, therefore, that John Gower takes the place of God the Creator in this traditional portrayal of the Third Day as suggested by the main details of the globe.² The prototype has been freely adapted here, the sub-division of the upper part of the earth being derived from geographical and astronomical sources. The bearded figure of John Gower, exactly repeated in the manuscript of the Hunterian Museum in Glasgow, may well be the poet's portrait. From a painting expressing a religious meaning, therefore, the illuminator has formed a secular one, stressing the dissatisfaction of the poet with his environment and his vigorous attempt to alter it. The question may be asked whether it was John Gower himself who suggested the subject to the illuminators, since this expressed his thoughts so cogently. The hypothesis is strengthened by the early date of the manuscripts which appear to have been executed in the poet's lifetime.

A mystical interpretation of the scenes of the Days of Creation is found in an Altar by Master Bertram in Hamburg's Church of St. Peter and now in the Art Gallery of that city.³ Its date is 1379. The first panel of the series shows God, the Creator, in a position similar to that of the Christ of the Third Day of the Rylands Library *Bible Historiée*, alluded to above. Christ is present also, as suggested by His head—a duality of figures, not the Trinity. This head is seen in an aureole of clouds from which devils descend towards the earthly globe on their way to

¹ Cf. the *Works of John Gower*, edited by G. C. Macaulay, vol. iv, *passim*. The subdivision of the world is already found in antique prototypes. Cf. p. 470, n. 1.

² Edited by O. H. Prior (Lausanne and Paris, 1913). H. Liebeschütz, *Kosmologische Motive in der Bildungswelt der Frühscholastik* (Hamburg, 1926), especially pp. 111 ff. and *Das Allegorische Weltbild der Heiligen Hildegard von Bingen* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1930), especially pp. 59 ff. Burne-Jones's angels holding the globes seem to be influenced by the angels of the Apocalypse, merged with the iconography of the Creation. A similar synthesis is observed in a manuscript by Margaret Macdonald of 1895. Cf. Th. Howarth, C. R. Mackintosh (London, 1952), Pl. VIII, c. and d.

³ A. Rohde, *Der Hamburger Petri-Altar* (Marburg, 1916); F. Burger, "Die Deutsche Malerei", in *Handbuch der Deutschen Kunsthistorischen Künste*, pp. 164 ff. This represents a rare duality, as opposed to the Trinity, studied by A. Heimann in the *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, ii (1938-9), 42 ff.

hell. One of these devils, Lucifer, is crowned and holds in his hand a scroll reading "Ascendam super altitudinem nubium similis ero altissimo" (Isa. xiv. 14). To understand the panel, it has to be remembered that the Fall of the Angels antedates, or accompanies, the creation of the world, according to the Church Fathers. It is worth noting that Master Bertram's scene is based on a combination of the Third Day and the Fall of the Angels, as earlier seen, for example, in the paraphrase of Genesis and Joshua by Aelfric in the British Museum (Cotton MS. Claudius B. IV), dated by Professor Wormald between 1025 and 1050. Here, the globe of the earth is absent and the naturalistic setting simplified by a linear style which forms a striking contrast to the non-realistic use of colour typical of the Canterbury School. In the Lothian Bible, mentioned above, the Creation is also preceded by the Fall of the Angels. This tradition is found earlier in the Moslem "Libro della Scala", which served as one of the sources of Dante's "Divine Comedy", where the Fall towards the centre of the earth is described, similar to Master Bertram's panel.¹

Through the iconographic adaptions of the Days of Creation, new light is thrown on the understanding of the designs of a vastly different nature and of a later date, such as are found in Boullée's "Cenotaph of Newton" (1784) and the works derived from it.² Here, a circular world is represented, showing the earth in its centre, undisturbed by the change in the interpretation of the universe from a Ptolemaic to a Copernican system. In Boullée's "Cenotaph" the sun, radiating behind the globe,

¹ E. Cerulli's edition of *Il Libro della Scala* (Rome, 1949), *passim*. On Dante's astronomy, cf. M. A. Orr, *Dante and the Early Astronomers* (London, 1913). The basic difference of point of view with regard to the Christian interpretation of the Fall of the Angels is based on Augustine versus Origen, cf. M. Meiss, *Painting in Florence and Siena* (Princeton, 1951); F. Antal, *Florentine Painting and its Social Background* (London, 1947). On the Fallen Angels in Jewish, Christian and Moslem tradition, cf. L. Jung in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s., xv (1924-5), pp. 467 ff. and xvi (1926-7), pp. 45 ff., 171 ff., 287 ff. As a source, the most important for later medieval developments is St. Anselm's *De Casu Diaboli*. Cf. also F. Wormald, *English Drawings of the 10th and 11th Centuries* (London, 1953), pp. 39 ff., and *Pierpont Morgan Library Review* (1930-5), p. 21.

² H. Rosenau, *Boullée's Treatise on Architecture* (London, 1953), *passim*.

forms a luminous circle round the earth, reminiscent of a halo. Another design by Boullée, for a façade of the National Library, is indebted to the astrological tradition since it shows the signs of the zodiac on a globe carried by twin Atlas figures (c. 1785). These facts indicate that in the late eighteenth century, when classical antiquity was being rediscovered and functional austerity permeated many of the most significant drawings, the medieval astronomical and astrological conceptions were not entirely obliterated but still played a part in the execution of works which appeared startlingly novel and unprecedented.

It may be worth noting that the type of cosmic iconography, sparingly figurative and eliminating the Creator, is congenial to the contemporary mind, as is well illustrated in Paul Nash's remarkable series of woodcuts representing the Creation from the First Book of Genesis. Here the scenes are rendered in a complex and highly dynamic style, stressing curvilinear composition, the very opposite of the earlier static interpretations. Independent of Nash's series, but equally significant as a re-interpretation of an old theme, is a Jewish artist's, Alva's, sequence of serigraphs of the Creation, accompanied by the well designed Hebrew text, illustration and lettering forming one artistic unit.¹

II *Architectural Tendencies and their Interpretation*

The conception of the synagogue as an architectural unit implies a place of assembly for the whole congregation as opposed to the small meeting halls of sectarian worshippers. It thus forms, perhaps, one of the most significant contributions to the history of architecture and art in general. It foreshadows Christian church building; a typical example is found in Jerash, the church being literally built on synagogue foundations.² The earliest synagogues, based as they are on Hellenistic and Roman prototypes, develop characteristic, novel features, among which the change from a "cosmological" orientation, based on sun worship, is replaced by the historical orientation towards

¹ P. Nash, *Genesis* (London, 1924); Alva, *The Story of the Creation* (New York, 1953).

² J. W. Crowfoot, *Churches at Jerash* (London, 1931), pp. 16 ff.

Jerusalem, thus expressing the spiritual centre symbolised by this city.¹

Two types of synagogue orientation can be distinguished, the earlier one, reminiscent of the Temple, emphasizing the light coming from the eastern direction by its façade, while the later examples orient the apse or niche towards Jerusalem. The latter arrangement, directing the worshipper from the entrance towards the focus of orientation, the Torah Shrine, was adapted from Jewish to Christian use with regard to the altar. It can be shown that the synagogues frequently adopted basic architectural features from the Temple, such as the fore-courts, the orientation, and the prevalent use of longitudinal direction. In the course of its history the synagogue was more and more regarded as a holy building, and this is exemplified in the inscriptions "ἀγιος" in Stobi, "sancta sinagoga" in Hammam Lif and "הַרְקָדָה" in Na'aran.² Thus the features which characterize the Early Christian church are, in fact, represented in a prior state of development in the synagogue. There, the direction towards the wall of the Torah Shrine is emphasized, whilst abstract decoration is mainly used to express the holiness of the building in the Palestinian synagogues. Against this background, four main architectural themes in the iconography can be distinguished—the Temple and the Torah Shrine on the one hand, and twin cities, Good and Evil, on the other.

The earliest coins representing distinctly Jewish motives belong to the Maccabean period. They show the Menorah, the lamp-stand with seven branches, which remained the symbol for Judaism throughout the centuries.³ Incidentally, the Menorah came to be regarded as the lamp or candlestick *par excellence*, and this led to its inclusion in, for example, Leone Battista Alberti's *De l'art de bien bâtir*, which was translated by Jean Martin and published in 1553. A more ambitious scheme, the representation of the Jewish Temple, is found on the coins of Bar Kokba

¹ Rosenau, *Jewish Art*, p. 15; also in *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, xvi (1936), 33 ff.

² Cf. above note.

³ A good survey is found in A. Reisenberg, *Ancient Hebrew Arts* (New York, 1950).

(132-5). The building is adorned by four columns and surmounted by a flat roof. It can be regarded as an adaption of a Graeco-Roman prototype, but is significant iconographically in its emphasis on an architectural motive. The influence of this type of coin is apparent in Dura-Europos (A.D. 244).¹ The painted panel over the niche for the scrolls is described by Sloane and Rostovtzeff as containing the Ark of the Torah. Thus, the picture of the shrine for the scrolls would be painted above their receptacle and, as a result, an unlikely and meaningless repetition achieved.² It is the Temple which is seen, a type of building closely related to the representation on the Bar Kokba coins, using the same flat ending instead of the gabled roof and two side columns, the only difference being that the doors are closed.³

The four pillars are also seen in the newly discovered tomb in Sheq-Abreq (Beth Shearim) for example. The arrangement on coins and in Dura does not reproduce the earlier Temples, except with regard to the flat roof, and can be best explained by the vision of the reconstructed, and, in a wider sense, the Messianic Temple, retaining the traditional features of the flat roof, but adding the "normal" pillars of a Greek façade.

In Rome, the picture of the Temple recurs on gold glasses but is generally represented in the conventional Hellenistic shape with gabled roof. One exceptional gold glass, now preserved in the Vatican, shows not only the building itself, the lamp-stand with the seven branches, the columns "Jachin" and "Boaz" and the sacred vessels, but also the "diplostoön"—the colonnade built by Herod. Incidentally, this type of "diplostoön" should not be confused with the architectural disposition in the synagogues of Alexandria, Antioch and Tiberias which are described as double "stoa", i.e., having a principal nave and

¹ Cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos and its Art* (Oxford, 1938), pp. 104 ff.; still by far the best survey of the subject. Cf. also E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbolism in the Graeco-Roman Period* (New York, 1953); R. Wischnitzer, *The Messianic Theme in the Paintings of Dura-Europos* (Chicago, 1948), *passim*. Also Du Mesnil Du Buisson, *Les peintures de la synagogue de Doura-Europos* (Rome, 1939), Sloane in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s. xxv (1934), pp. 6 ff.

² A full discussion is found in Leeven, op. cit. p. 23 and pp. 14 f., n. 4.

³ Cf. the present writer in *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, op. cit.

two aisles on each side, as became typical of the larger Christian basilicas. The iconographic theme of the Temple survived in the Middle Ages and is clearly recognizable in the adaptions of the Ashburnham Pentateuch and the mosaics of Santa Maria Maggiore. In Palestine, the Theotokos Chapel on Mount Nebo and mosaic representing the altar in El-Mehayet also reflect the same prototype. It is found as a full page illumination in the Haggadah of Sarayevo. (Pl. II.) Even in the "Liber Floridus" of Gand, the interior of the Church of St. Omer is depicted in a similar way, as in some of the Jewish gold glasses representing the Torah Shrine, the difference being that the altar takes the place of the shrine and the two candlesticks take the place of the lampstand with seven branches ; but a view of the exterior is added to the interior, a typical feature of Romanesque art not found in Antiquity.¹

The Messianic Temple is located in, and stands for, the holy city of Jerusalem, based on the tradition found in Ezekiel, 40-3. In a slow process during the Middle Ages, it is the latter type which gains in iconographic importance. Its prototypes are found in Roman mosaics and wall decorations which fall into two clearly divided types : the perspective and evocative views which are popular in Pompeii,² and the geographical description representing individual towns according to their captions, as found in the Madaba mosaics. In the representations of the heavenly Jerusalem, the two types converge, since the former provides the architectural pattern whereas the emphasis on meaning connects it with the latter. A classical tradition survives pictorially in the confrontation of two cities, similar to that described by Homer on the shield of Achilles.³ This is seen in the representation of the new Rome, Byzantium, as contrasted with the old city, or in the coupling of Bethlehem or Rome and Jerusalem on the triumphal arches of basilicas in Rome and Ravenna.⁴ In Jewish iconography, a similar contrast is found in Dura, where a pagan temple

¹ Cf. the present writer's *Design and Medieval Architecture* (London, 1934).

² Cf. L. Curtius, *Die Wandmalereien in Pompeji* (Leipzig, 1929) ; and P. W. Lehmann, *Roman Wall Paintings from Boscoreale* (1953).

³ This contrast is still alive in Lorenzetti's rendering of the Good and Bad Governments in the Palazzo Publico in Siena, of the fourteenth century.

⁴ Morey, op. cit. pp. 168 ff.

confronts the Tabernacle on the opposite wall. Idols are omitted since their glorification was to be avoided, but the fallen Dagon is represented before another picture of a pagan temple. The arrangement of two related cities remains customary for the representation of Sodom and Gomorrah and this is found, for example, in the Ashburnham Pentateuch and, at a later period, in a Judaeo-French Bible compilation (Add. MS. 11639) of the thirteenth century in the British Museum.¹ Its place in the former corroborates the well-known Jewish element in this manuscript's iconography.

The heavenly Jerusalem was, on the other hand, a popular subject in Christian art, as may be seen in the "Liber Floridus" of Gand and the *Stuttgart Passionale*, to quote only two examples. In both these it is round; the latter a ground plan with interspersed side elevations, the other a circle of walls and towers. A correct square interpretation, according to the Apocalypse of St. John, is found in the Beatus of St. Sever, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The city of Jerusalem as an isolated symbol does not appear in the Haggadot, although the Haggadah of Sarayevo² retains an illumination of the Messianic Temple, as stated above. In Polish and South German seventeenth and eighteenth century timber synagogues, the heavenly Jerusalem formed part of the wall decorations as, for example, in the synagogue of Chodorow; it was preserved in Unterlimpurg, and, until destroyed in the last war, was found in the synagogue of Kirchheim in the Wuerzburg Museum.³

The Middle Ages knew frequent representations of the Virgin and St. Michael standing on the snake in Christian art, whilst the evil city is frequently accompanied by the representation of snakes and fire; for example, in the Spanish Beatus manuscript of the Rylands Library (Latin MS. 8), with regard to Babylon, a city associated with a dragon whose mouth forms the gate. It

¹ Leveen, op. cit. Pl. XXVI, 1.

² It goes without saying that Jerusalem appears frequently as the background of the prophet Elijah and is also suggested when representing the mourning of the Jews of Babylon in the 19th century. But these themes are of a totally different character from the ones dealt with in this study.

³ Cf. A. Breier, M. Eisler and M. Grunwald, *Holzsynagogen in Polen* (Vienna, 1934), p. 3 of the Appendix.

is by a fusion of these two elements that a new type emerges—the evil city on a snake. Literary traditions also abound: The Apocalypse of Abraham states, "The world rests upon Leviathan." Another source exists in the New Testament Apocrypha: "Divus pisces jacentes super aquas . . . tenentes totam terram." Reference to snakes and Babylon are also found in Jewish legends and in Christian writers such as Vincent of Beauvais.¹

These different elements gave rise to a type represented in the Hebrew-French biblical compilation Add. MS. 11639 in the British Museum dated about 1277/8. This shows an evil city standing on a dragon or serpent. It is unlikely to represent Sodom, as suggested by Leveen, but is more likely to signify Babylon; this may also be suggested by the later caption, which quotes a verse from Isa. lxvi. 24, a book in which Babylon is referred to as evil. Intermediary examples belonging to this type are unknown at present, but the continuation of the tradition is apparent when comparing the almost identical painting of Worms in the synagogue of Mohilev with that of the miniature mentioned above. Here again may be seen a city standing on a snake, the evil character of which is emphasized by its arrow-like tongue. The caption ווּרְמָה, a pun on "worms", gives the name of the German city of Worms, a town from which the Jews had been expelled.

The cities of Babylon and Worms thus conform to the same prototype. Whether there existed cycles contrasting good and evil in Jewish illumination, it is impossible to decide with certainty, in view of the destruction of so many monuments and manuscripts, but this is by no means unlikely since the theme was set in Dura and may have existed in Kirchheim,² where the

¹ M. R. James, *A Catalogue of the Latin Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester, 1921); Rosenau, *Jewish Art*, p. 75, n. 11; J. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, i, pp. 26 ff. and v, pp. 41 ff. notes 116–46. Leveen, op. cit. p. 128. Professor Wormald kindly draws my attention to the relationship with the "mouth of Hell", which is apparent in the dragon's teeth.

² Cf. M. Lowenthal, *A World Passed By* (New York and London, 1933), p. 307 mentions two views of Jerusalem in Kirchheim. This seems unlikely as a meaningless duplication and the contrast between the former and Babylon appears more likely. Cf. also p. 308 which seems a slip of the pen with regard to the synagogue in Bechhofen's decoration by Jerusalem (?) flanking lions.

continuation of iconographic tradition is exemplified. At any rate, the elements Babylon and Jerusalem, evil and holy, can be reconstructed from the scanty examples preserved.

It is clear from the evidence here presented that the Jewish tradition in Palestine emphasized architectural elements. The question may be asked whether full pictorial cycles existed there in the early Christian period.¹ It seems that the Temple picture is Palestinian, but the rich cycles as found in Dura and suggested in the sarcophagi are contributions of the Diaspora. That the Scrolls of the Law were ever decorated with pictures is out of the question. It is the decoration of synagogues, the cycles of the sarcophagi and the manuscripts of the "Haggadot" with reference to Passover and to other happenings which appear as the obvious means for pictorial expression. Indeed, wall paintings, mosaics, manuscripts, and sarcophagi should be studied conjointly. In this light many of the early Christian sarcophagi have to be reconsidered, since they show quite clearly the superimposition of a Christian content on a Jewish prototype, as when in the "Jonah" sarcophagus, for example, the "Raising of Lazarus" is added to the Jewish subject matter, and the bucolic background.

The extant examples of Jewish and Jewish influenced art point to the Diaspora. The mosaics of the Palestinian synagogues so far discovered belong to the fifth and sixth centuries, that is, a later date, and therefore fail to invalidate this statement.

In this connection the interpretation of the central panels in Na'aran and Beth Alpha, as describing the sun god, has to be reconsidered. Surely, even for the upholders of the laxest of Jewish interpretation, this subject appears to be entirely out of place in a synagogue. Its meaning must be in some way related to the teaching of Judaism, and thus in Beth Alpha a sequence progressing from God as the Saviour, depicted in the panel of the "Akedah", as God as the ruler of the universe, as suggested by the representation of sun, moon and stars in the second panel,

¹ This problem is not considered in C. Roth's article on Jewish iconography in the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, quoted above.

and God as the Giver of the Law, by the representation of the Temple, is indicated.¹

It is thus likely that it was the emphasis on the architectural theme which formed the Palestinian contribution, whilst the Diaspora developed the illuminated cycles. This hypothesis, based on the extant material, is also likely on religious grounds since for the latter the Hellenistic influence was most significant, as so typically seen in Philo of Alexandria. It is therefore in the architectural representations that the primary contributions to Jewish iconography may be found.

In order to assess the Jewish contribution to late classical art the lack of a centralized organization of the synagogue has also to be considered. From this, broad variations in outlook were derived, and these had their influence also on the attitude towards art. It is quite possible, therefore, that in Palestine the attitude was more rigorous than in Alexandria, Antioch or Rome, although at the present time no final answer can be given in this respect.²

In conclusion, a number of facts emerge from the works of art studied. Jewish artists, under the influence of religious inspiration, transformed current architectural and cosmological motives in a novel manner. They orientated their synagogues and directed them towards the Ark, thus producing a significant prototype for the Christian church. By constantly eliminating the figure of the Creator and isolating from Hellenistic and Roman iconography, the Temple and the Holy City, they emphasised an abstract spirituality and a universal tendency in art.³

¹ On the interpretation of God as ruler of the cosmos compare E. R. Good-enough, *By Light, Light* (New Haven, 1935).

² This point is illuminated from inscriptions by J. B. Frey, *Inscriptionum Judaicarum, Città del Vaticano* (1936-52).

³ The universal tendencies in Judaism are clearly described in their beginnings by Professor W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 3rd edn. (Baltimore, 1953).

THE PLACE-NAMES OF THE DOMESDAY MANUSCRIPTS¹

By P. H. SAWYER, M.A.

ASSISTANT IN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

DOMESDAY BOOK is important not only for historians but also for students of English place-names.² It is based on a survey of England made in 1086 and was itself compiled before 1100, possibly even before the death of William I in September 1087.³ Its *Index Locorum* records over 23,000 place-name forms (including repetitions and variants), and for many place-names it provides the first evidence. For example, of the 500 place-names in G- listed in Ekwall's *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-names*, Domesday Book is the earliest source cited for over 200 while only 71 are traced to pre-conquest sources some of which are themselves only preserved in post-conquest copies. It may therefore be claimed that because of its scope and date Domesday Book is the most important source of English place-name forms.

¹ I should like to thank Dr. F. E. Harmer, Miss M. Dominica Legge, Professor A. McIntosh and Dr. R. Forsberg for their help and criticism.

² The manuscript is preserved in the Public Record Office. The printed text, in two volumes corresponding to the two volumes of the original, was issued in 1783 without title-pages. These were reissued later by the Record Commission who also published, in 1816, a volume of *Indices* and a volume of *Additamenta* including Exon Domesday, see below p. 484, n. 1. The bibliography of this edition is most conveniently discussed in the Public Record Office's pamphlet *Domesday Re-bound* (H.M.S.O., 1954), pp. 11-13. Vols. i and ii are here referred to as DB and LDB respectively.

³ For a general survey of Domesday research see D. C. Douglas, "The Domesday Survey", *History*, xxi (1936-7), 249-57. For more recent work see below *passim*. The date of the compilation of Domesday Book is discussed by V. H. Galbraith, "The Making of Domesday Book", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii (1942), 161-77; D. C. Douglas, *The Domesday Monachorum of Christ Church, Canterbury* (Royal Historical Society, 1944), pp. 23-5, cf. the review of this work by R. V. Lennard in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxi (1946), 253-60; and by V. H. Galbraith and J. Tait, *The Herefordshire Domesday* (Pipe Roll Society, New Series xxv, 1947 and 1948), pp. xxv-xxvi. Confirmation of the early dating may be deduced from the pamphlet *Domesday Re-bound*.

Before its evidence can be used to the best advantage it is necessary for both philologists and historians to understand the process of its compilation. Students of this problem have used besides Domesday Book other manuscripts deriving from the same enquiry, in particular those that are based on the earlier stages. These are themselves important for the information they contain additional to that preserved in Domesday Book, and they frequently contain better place-name forms than those in Domesday Book. These forms have been used by philologists, interested in etymologies and eleventh-century phonology and orthography, and by historians concerned with the relations between Domesday Book and these related manuscripts.

In this article an attempt will be made to indicate the value of the place-name forms as evidence for the relations between the manuscripts in which they occur and also to question some of the assumptions of philologists who have perhaps not fully appreciated the significance of the "satellite texts".

Exon Domesday, or the incomplete survey of Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, and Dorset that forms the bulk of the manuscript known as the *Liber Exoniensis*,¹ is closely related to the account of the same areas in DB. Some scholars have considered the two works to be independent compilations from the "original returns" of the Domesday Enquiry,² while others, particularly Baring, have argued that DB for the south-west of England was derived from Exon.³ Baring based his argument, in part, on a comparison of the place-names in the two manuscripts, but Dr. Olof von Feilitzen has written, "the evidence adduced by Baring is scarcely conclusive, and the numerous discrepancies between the two versions in the spelling of place- and personal-names

¹ *Libri Censualis, vocati Domesday Book, Additamenta* (Record Commission, 1816), pp. 1-493. Besides Exon Domesday, referred to here as Exon, the *Liber Exoniensis* contains an account of a geld collected in the south-west. For this see V. H. Galbraith, "The Date of the Geld Rolls in Exon Domesday", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxv (1950), 1-17; and J. F. A. Mason, "The Date of the Geld Rolls", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxix (1954), 283-9.

² For example, O. J. Reichel, *Victoria History of the County of Devon*, i, 378-9.

³ F. H. Baring, "The Exeter Domesday", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxvii (1912), 309-18. See also R. Welldon Finn, "The Evolution of Successive Versions of Domesday Book", *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lxvi (1951), 561-4.

favours the assumption that they are independent copies of the same original".¹

The following examination of the place-names in both manuscripts supports Baring's argument.² It must, however, be emphasized that he did not rely on the evidence of place-name forms alone. A discussion of the other evidence would be beyond the scope of the present article but it may be remarked that it is not to be dismissed as "scarcely conclusive".

A very large number of names in Exon have Latin inflexions that are, in the equivalent names in DB, either dropped or represented by a final -e. For example :

Exon		DB
Acforda	fol. 25	Acford
Sepetona	fol. 27	Septone
Froma	fol. 198	Frome
Badentone	fol. 95	Badentone
inter Barnestablām et		inter Totenais et Barnestaple ³
Toteneis et Lidefordam .	fol. 334b	et Lideford
		fol. 108b

If such differences are ignored, a large number of names common to both manuscripts have the same spelling. This close correspondence between them is not in itself sufficient to prove the dependence of DB on Exon, but a comparison of the variant forms of the same names in both does, in fact, go far to prove the interdependence of these two manuscripts.

Both DB and Exon are arranged by fiefs. If the procedure of the Domesday enquiry was the same in the south-west as it appears to have been elsewhere in the country, and there is no reason to suppose that it was fundamentally different, the source of these feudally arranged surveys was a series of "original

¹ Olof von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book* (*Nomina Germanica* 3, Uppsala, 1937), p. 9, n. 1.

² Extensions of manuscript abbreviations are indicated by the use of different type. Initial letters are printed as capitals, regardless of the manuscript reading, but capital letters occurring in other positions are not preserved. Capital V, which does not occur in the examples quoted in an initial position, is printed as u. All the place-name forms quoted from DB and Exon have been checked in the manuscripts. Cornish examples are omitted from the discussion of individual place-names because they are predominantly Celtic and therefore raise special problems, but the statistics of particular forms, see below pp. 492-7, include the Cornish examples.

³ The printed text has *Rarnestaple*.

returns " in which the information was arranged by hundreds and by vills. In these, to judge by the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis*,¹ the only fairly complete copy of a set of " original returns " that has been preserved, each vill was named only once. If more than one tenant-in-chief held land in any one vill its name would be repeated in DB under each fief. The rearrangement of the " original returns " into Exon and DB, has, therefore, sometimes resulted in the same name being recorded several times, not always in the same form. It is, of course, not always possible to be certain that similar names in DB (or Exon) refer to the same place and not to different places with the same name, but if those cases are studied where it is fairly certain that the different references are to the same place, the variants in DB under different fiefs are found to parallel the variants in Exon under the same fiefs. If DB was derived from the " original returns " independently of Exon it is extremely unlikely that there would be, in all these cases, such a close correspondence between them in variant forms of the same name. Only a few examples are given below.

<i>Exon</i>		<i>DB</i>		<i>Modern form etc.</i> ²
Meroda	fol. 301b	Merode	fol. 107	Marwood. PND 50
Merehoda	fol. 408b	Merehode	fol. 115b	
Mereuda	fol. 420	Mereude	fol. 113	
Wellecómá	fol. 408b	Wellecome	fol. 115b	Woolacombe. PND 54
Wolnecoma ³	fol. 401	Wolnecome	fol. 110	
Herlescoma	fol. 407	Herlescome	fol. 115	Yarnscombe. PND 82
Hernescoma	fol. 293	Hernescome	fol. 106	
Poteforda	fol. 399	Poteforde	fol. 110	West Putford. PND 160
Podiforda	fol. 93b	Podiford	fol. 101	
Boltesberia	fol. 220	Boltesberie	fol. 105	Bolberry. PND 307
Boteberia	fol. 219b	Boteberie	fol. 105b	
Motberia	fol. 221	Mortberie	fol. 105	Modbury. PND 279
Motbilia	fol. 217b	Motbilie	fol. 105b	

¹ N. E. S. A. Hamilton, *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis* (Royal Society of Literature, 1876), pp. 1-96. Referred to here as ICC.

² The abbreviations used here for counties and for works on place-names are those used by E. Ekwall, *The Concise Dictionary of English Place-Names* (3rd edn., 1947) with the addition of PNCA—P. H. Reaney, *The place-names of Cambridgeshire* (English Place-Name Society, xix, 1943) and KPN—J. K. Wallenberg, *Kentish Place-Names* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1931). Where forms are given without reference to one of these works the source is Ekwall, op. cit.

³ Altered from *Welnecoma*.

The same correspondence between the two manuscripts is seen in the references to different places with the same name. In these it is possible, although improbable, that the variants are due to the "original returns". For example, many place-names in Somerset and Devon include the OE word *hiwisc*, which has, in these names, developed into the modern form *Huish*:

	<i>Exon</i>		<i>DB</i>
Hiuuis ($\times 2$)	fol. 355	Hiwis ($\times 2$)	fol. 95b
Heuuuis	fol. 427b	Hewis	fol. 93b
Hieuys	fol. 442b	Hiwis	fol. 94b
Hewis	fol. 464	Hewis	fol. 96b
Hewis	fol. 220b	Hewis	fol. 104b
Heuis	fol. 322	Hewis	fol. 109
Yuuis	fol. 376b	Iewis	fol. 116b
Hyuuis	fol. 388b	Hiwis	fol. 112b
Heuuisa	fol. 400	Hewise	fol. 110b
Langehewis	fol. 135b	Langehewis	fol. 103b
Goheuuis	fol. 292	Gohewis	fol. 106
Meleuuis	fol. 305	Meleewis	fol. 107b
Bochiyuuiis	fol. 407	Bochewis	fol. 115
(ad) Yuuesleiam	fol. 388	Iweslei	fol. 112b

Other groups of place-names are based on such river names as *Clyst* and *Otter*. Although variations in these are slight in both Exon and DB, such as there are occur in parallel. A common place-name element in the south west is OE *cumb*. A few examples will serve to show the agreement between Exon and DB in the forms of this name.

	<i>Exon</i>		<i>DB</i>
Coma	fol. 133 etc.	Come	fol. 103 etc.
Côma	fol. 220b	Cume	fol. 105b
Côba	fol. 220b	Combe	fol. 105b
Côba	fol. 320	Cumbe	fol. 109
Conba	fol. 324b	Cûbe	fol. 109
Lâcoma	fol. 337	Lacome	fol. 114
Loscûma	fol. 368b	Loscume	fol. 111

The close correspondence between Exon and DB in these, and similar, variants indicates a close relationship between the two manuscripts. Exon, however, contains much information that is not in DB and DB, for the area covered by Exon, apparently contains nothing that is not in Exon. This means that Exon could not have been derived from DB unless much additional

information was also used. It would be more reasonable to argue that DB derived from Exon. It is not claimed that this is, in itself, sufficient to prove the point, but it is claimed that this evidence supports the conclusion, based on other considerations, that DB was derived directly or through an intermediate stage from Exon.

The discrepancies remarked by von Feilitzen remain. Some are due to the printed version. Baring pointed out that where the printed text has *Loduntona* (p. 352) the manuscript has *Lochintona* (fol. 375) in agreement with DB *Lochintone* (fol. 97b) and that *Hane* (p. 316) should read *Hanc* (fol. 337b) in agreement with DB *Hanc* (fol. 114).¹ An examination of the manuscript shows that there are other such errors in the printed version of Exon :

	<i>Exon</i>	<i>DB</i>	<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
<i>Printed text</i>	<i>manuscript</i>		
Gelingeha	Gelingeham fol. 27b	Gelingeham fol. 75	Gillingham. PND 5
Guilcestre	Guilcestre fol. 171b	Guilcestre fol. 91	Ilchester
Bernurtona	Bernintona fol. 179	Bernintone fol. 103b	Burrington. PND 362
Efforda	Esforda fol. 301	Esforde fol. 107	Ashford. PND 24

As well as these clear errors there are doubtful readings, some of which will be discussed below.

The remaining discrepancies are of three kinds.

(1) Those names where the scribe of DB has mistranscribed the forms in Exon. Other forms confirm the accuracy of Exon in these and the error in DB is easily explained.

	<i>Exon</i>	<i>DB</i>	<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
<i>Dorset</i>			
Heltona	. fol. 39	Eltone . fol. 78b	Hilton. PND 189 <i>Haltona, Helton</i>
Iwerna	. fol. 49	Werne . fol. 81b	Iwerne. PND 10, 26, 57 <i>Iwern(e)</i>
<i>Somerset</i>			
Betministra	fol. 90b	Beiminstre . fol. 86b	Bedminster <i>Bedmenistr(a)</i>
Briuetona	fol. 90b	Brumetona . fol. 86b	Bruton <i>Briweton</i>
Babakari	. fol. 277b	Babachan . fol. 92b	Babcary <i>Babekary</i>
Nonin	. fol. 364	Noiun . fol. 96b	Nunney. <i>Nony, Nuni</i>

(This is a simple confusion of minims and the form in Exon might easily be mistaken for *Noiun*.)

¹ Baring, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxvii (1912), 316-7.

<i>Exon</i>		<i>DB</i>		<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
Ciretona .	fol. 364b	Eiretone .	fol. 96b	Cheriton
Telma .	fol. 447	Teluue .	fol. 98	<i>Chirintone</i> Elm <i>Theaumes, Elne</i>
<i>Devon</i>				
Pinnoe .	fol. 95b	Pinnoch .	fol. 101	Pinhoe. PND 443 <i>Peonho, Pinho</i>

(The -e of Exon in this name might easily be read as -c. The reverse is the case for Cheriton above.)

Pillanda .	fol. 127b	Welland .	fol. 102b	Plland. PND 55 <i>Plland</i>
Pedicches-wella .	fol. 127b	Wediches-welle .	fol. 102b	Pickwell. PND 44 <i>Pido(c)keswell</i>
Dinintona .	fol. 219	Dunintone .	fol. 105b	Dinnaton. PND 269 <i>Dynenton</i>
Dueltona .	fol. 295	Oueltone .	fol. 106b	Dolton. PND 366 <i>Duwelton(e)</i>
Clisewic .	fol. 339b	Chisewic .	fol. 114	Clyst St. George. PND 585 <i>Clyst wicon, Clistwike</i>

(2) This group includes those names where the scribe of DB has attempted to correct real or apparent errors in Exon or has correctly extended abbreviations in Exon. It would not be unreasonable to suggest that a scribe familiar with OE place-names could have extended, or corrected, the following :

Langat' .	fol. 59	Langetone .	fol. 83b	Langton Herring. PND 247
Esteha .	fol. 105b	Estham .	fol. 87	Eastham. So.
Brstou .	fol. 141b	Bristou .	fol. 88	Bristol. So.
Hordcerleia .	fol. 147b	Horcerlei .	fol. 88b	Orchardleigh. So.
Draintuna .	fol. 429b	Draitune .	fol. 94	Drayton. So.
Fihida .	fol. 431b	Fifhide .	fol. 94	Fivehead. So.
Didasá .	fol. 120b	Didasham .	fol. 102	Dittisham. PND 322
Bochelan .	fol. 123	Bocheland .	fol. 102	Buckland Filleigh. PND 90
Wafforda .	fol. 392b	Wasforde .	fol. 112	Washford Pyne. PND 397

That the DB scribe did sometimes correct his source is shown very clearly in those cases where the "correction" was itself an error. For example, Exon *Notforda* (fol. 31b) is in agreement with other early forms of Nutford in Dorset, the name clearly being derived from OE *hnutu* plus *ford*. This name is written as *Nortforde* in DB (fol. 75b), presumably on the (incorrect)

assumption that its first element was OE *norv*. Elsewhere DB correctly makes the same alteration, i.e. *Nortmoltone* (DB fol. 101) for *Normoltonç* (Exon fol. 95); North Moltone, cf. PND 344.

In Exon prepositions are sometimes joined to names and generally DB separates them, e.g. *Adbrigam* (Exon fol. 57) becomes *ad Brigam* (DB fol. 83b), but in one case DB made a mistake in doing this. *Incrintona* (x 3, Exon fol. 402) becomes *Crintone* (DB fol. 110b) for Ilkerton, Devon; cf. PND 64 where other early forms are given, e.g. *Hilcrinton*, *Ilcrynton*.

The correction of *Rluperiga* (Exon fol. 397) to *Luperige* (DB fol. 112b) for Lupridge (cf. PND 303) may have been due to the preceding entry in Exon, *Luperiga*. Similarly the alteration of *Eriñtona* (Exon fol. 85b) to *Ermentone* (DB fol. 100b) for Ermington (cf. PND 272) may have been due to the occurrence in the margin of the same folio of Exon of the form (*ad*) *Hermentonam*.¹ Whether or not this is a reasonable explanation it is worth remarking that a similar extension occurs in the case of Galmpton (cf. PND 304), where Exon has *Walenitona* (fol. 322) and DB has *Walementone* (fol. 109). In both cases the minims here read as *-in-* or *-ni-* may in fact read *-m-*.

There are three further cases where DB corrects a corrupt form in Exon.

<i>Exon</i>	<i>DB</i>	<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
Speftesberia fol. 47b	Spehtesberie fol. 82	Spettisbury. PND 76
Bulfestrensis fol. 182	Bufestre . fol. 103b	Buckfast. PND 293
Bulfestra . fol. 183	Bufestre . fol. 104	Buckfast. PND 293
Morchetona fol. 169	Monechetone fol. 90b	West Monkton. So.

In the first of these the extraordinary form *Speft-* is almost certainly an error for *Spest-* where the *-st-* stands for OE *-ht-*. This is not unusual in Exon and where it occurs DB frequently alters it to *-ht-*. The scribe of DB may well have recognized this *-ft-* form as an error. The other examples cannot be so conveniently explained. It is possible, however, that Exon was not the immediate source of DB but that there was an intermediate stage, a fair copy or slightly abbreviated version of Exon.² The

¹ The probability of this is increased by the fact that when Exon has the form *Erñtone* (fol. 218) without any such fuller reading nearby, DB has *Erñtone* also (fol. 105b).

² This was suggested by V. H. Galbraith, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii (1942), 165-6.

preparation of such a copy might have provided an opportunity for some doubtful readings in *Exon* to be checked against its source, the "original returns" of the enquiry. This may be the explanation of some of the corrections discussed above. There are, therefore, a few names that have better forms in *DB* than in *Exon*. Whether or not the explanations suggested above are acceptable, these cases are certainly not numerous or startling enough to be regarded as insuperable obstacles to the acceptance of *Exon* as the source, direct or indirect, of *DB*. It is worth remarking that the differences between *Exon* and *DB* discussed under this heading are, with three or four exceptions, of a different kind from those listed in the preceding group.

(3) The third, and last, group of discrepancies between the place-name forms in *Exon* and *DB* includes those names where the two manuscripts exhibit different scribal traditions. For example, where *Exon* uses *w* or *uu* as if to serve both for the consonant *w* and a following vowel, *DB* uses *w*, *uu* or *u* and a vowel.

<i>Exon</i>	<i>DB</i>	<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
Luluurda . fol. 28	Luluorde . fol. 75	Lulworth. PND 140
Oscheruulla ¹ fol. 42	Oscherwille fol. 78b	Askerswell. PND 237-8
Wllega . fol. 144b	Wilege . fol. 88b	Wooley. So.

A few examples will serve to illustrate the variety of such scribal differences between the two manuscripts.

<i>Exon</i>	<i>DB</i>	<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
Obpe Win- borna . fol. 27	Opewinburne fol. 75	Wimborne St. Giles. PND 87
Medessan . fol. 29b	Medesham . fol. 75b	Edmondsham. PND 101
Canolla . fol. 62	Cnolle . fol. 82b	Knowle. PND 132
Nortchori . fol. 105	Nortcuri . fol. 86b	North Curry. So.
Sheptuna . fol. 276	Sceptone . fol. 92b	Shepton Montague. So.
Bisobestona fol. 280	Biscopestone fol. 93	? So.
Bristriche- stona . fol. 331	Brichticestone fol. 110	Brixton Barton. PND 258
Bristeles- borda . fol. 481b	Bristeles- worde . fol. 118	Brexworthy. PND 133
Coltesborda fol. 481b	Coltesworde fol. 118	? D.

In these last two examples the printed text has *-horda* and this may be a correct reading although *-borda*, with *-b-* for *-w-*, is

¹ This reading, with *-uu-*, is that of the printed text. The manuscript has four minims that could be read as *-wi-*.

both possible and more likely. These may be compared with the forms for Bloxworth (cf. PND 65) where *Exon* has *Blochesborda* (fol. 36b) and *DB* has *Blocheshorde* (fol. 77b).

It was probably as clear to the scribe of *DB* as it is to philologists today that at least some of the scribes of *Exon* were not completely familiar with the native English tongue. In fact, von Feilitzen has written, "At the same time *Exon* in some respects shows stronger traces of Anglo-Norman scribal influence than *DB*, e.g. the extreme frequency of prosthetic *e* before *s* plus *a consonant*, the frequent use of the letter *y* for OE *i* and the practically consistent unvoicing of final *-d* to *-t* in *-fort*, *-lant*, etc."¹

It will not be possible, here, to discuss this judgement of von Feilitzen's in full but a few examples may serve to draw attention to some of *Exon*'s peculiarities. The first example of Anglo-Norman or French scribal influence in *Exon* referred to by von Feilitzen is the occurrence of prosthetic *e* before initial *S* plus *a consonant*. This occurs also in *DB* itself and is almost certainly due to French influence.² Thus, Sleaford in Lincolnshire is *Sliowaford* in an OE text but in *DB* is written *Eslaforde*, Smithdown in Lancashire from OE *smērē* plus *dūn* became *Esmedune* in *DB*, and Snodland in Kent is *Snoddingland* in an OE text but in *DB* is *Esnoiland*.

It is, as von Feilitzen remarked, extremely frequent in *Exon* but is generally corrected in the equivalent entries in *DB*. There are in the place-names of *Exon* 69 examples of it³ and under 47 cases where it might have occurred but did not.⁴ Of the 69

¹ von Feilitzen, p. 9.

² Ibid. p. 72, M. K. Pope, *From Latin to Modern French* (2nd edn., 1952), §§ 361, 603, 1106.

³ This total excludes *Hesmalacoma* (*Exon* fol. 313b) which in *DB* (fol. 108b) appears as *Smelecome*, *Smallicombe*, cf. PND 628. It also excludes place-names in *Ess-*, e.g. *Essecestra* (*Exon* fol. 94b), cf. PND 20-1. It is interesting to note that *DB* preserves the initial *E-* in these names and also in such cases as *Esselingaforda* (*Exon* fol. 468b), cf. *DB* fol. 117b, *Esselingeforde*; *Shillingford*, cf. PND 503 and *Essapla* (*Exon* fol. 488), cf. *DB* fol. 118b, *Essaple*; *Shapleigh*, cf. PND 470 where this form from *DB* is not quoted. If the index to the *Liber Exoniensis*, in the same volume as the printed text, is used for the compilation of statistics of forms in *Exon*, care has to be taken to exclude forms from the *Geld* accounts, see p. 484, n. 1.

⁴ This total comprises 33 in *St-*, 5 in *Sp-*, 5 in *Sc-*, 2 in *Sh-*, 1 in *Sc-*, and 1 in *Sch-*. Abbreviations of *Sanctus*, etc., are not included.

DB corrects 65.¹ There are in Exon 14 cases of etymological *E-* in *Es-* plus *a consonant*, e.g. *Esforde*, *Estone*, *Estham*, *Escewiche*. DB generally preserves the initial *E-* in these, it being clearly etymological. But in one case DB drops such an initial *E-*, i.e. *Eastrip*, near Brewham, Somerset from OE *east* plus *þorp* which is *Estropa* in Exon (fol. 382b) but *Storpe* in DB (fol. 97b).

Exon and DB have 139 names in common having OE *ford* as a final element. Of these 90 are inflected in Exon, e.g. *-forda*, and do not have final *-d*. Of the remainder 40 have *-fort* and only 9 (all in Somerset and Dorset) preserve the *-d*. There is none with final *-t* in DB, 110 being in *-d*, and 29 in *-de*, the latter corresponding to inflected names in Exon. Similarly of the 47 names common to Exon and DB with OE *land* as a final element, 38 in Exon are inflected, 8 are in *-lant* and one in *-lan*. There is none with final *-t* in DB. This unvoicing of *-d* to *-t* is probably due to Anglo-Norman influence. Von Feilitzen considers most cases of DB *t* for OE *d* as due to this but remarks that "there was also a tendency in OE for final *d* to become *t* in unstressed positions, especially after *n*, *r* and *l*. . . . Hence DB *-t* < *-d* may sometimes reflect native sound-development."² Even if *-t* was a possible phonological development in some dialects this spelling indicates a certain orthographic non-conservativeness, itself probably due to Anglo-Norman influence. Whatever the explanation of this characteristic of Exon, it is remarkable that DB restores the traditional *-d*.

Among the other consistent differences between Exon and DB the cases where DB has *-ge-* for Exon's *-ghe-* may be noted.

*Exon**DB*

Ringhesteta	.	.	fol. 60	Ringestede	.	.	.	fol. 83b
Ringhestede	.	.	fol. 60	Ringestede	.	.	.	fol. 83b
Peghenes	.	.	fol. 477	Pegens	.	.	.	fol. 98b
Ringhendona	.	.	fol. 300	Ringedone	.	.	.	fol. 107
Eighebera	.	.	fol. 307b	Eigebere	.	.	.	fol. 107b
Langhestan	.	.	fol. 311b	Langestan	.	.	.	fol. 108
Chenighedona	.	.	fol. 343b	Chenigedone	.	.	.	fol. 114b

¹ The 4 that DB does not correct are:

*Exon**DB**Modern forms*

Esturt	.	fol. 272b	Esturt	.	fol. 92	Stert, So.
Estana	.	fol. 431b	Estone	.	fol. 94	Stone, So.
Eslida	.	fol. 445	Eslide	.	fol. 94b	Lyde, So.
Estreta	.	fol. 340b	Estrete	.	fol. 114b	Strete Raleigh. PND

² von Feilitzen, pp. 96-7.

Von Feilitzen speaks of this characteristic of Exon as "in accordance with Continental usage" and according to Miss Pope it is a northern French feature.¹

In DB generally the voiceless stop (k) is represented before *e* and *i* by *ch*. Von Feilitzen explains this as "in accordance with Anglo-Norman usage".² It is extremely frequent in Exon, although less so than in DB owing to the prevalence in the former of endings in *-a*. For example :

	<i>Exon</i>		<i>DB</i>
Wica	fol. 144	Wiche	fol. 88b
Estoca	fol. 146b	Stoche	fol. 88b
Cruca	fol. 89	Cruche	fol. 86
but			
Chingestona	fol. 150b	Chingestone	fol. 89
Bichecōma	fol. 358b	Bichecome	fol. 95b
Estochet	fol. 267b	Stochet	fol. 92

Infrequently Exon has *ch* for (k) in other positions, for example :

Churi	fol. 89	Churi	fol. 86
Cochra	fol. 107	Cocre	fol. 87
Acha	fol. 433	Ache	fol. 94

Exon sometimes uses the letter *k* where DB has *ch*, for example :

Kingesberia	fol. 156	Chingesberie	fol. 89
Babakari	fol. 277b	Babachan	fol. 92b
Kinuardestuna	fol. 283	Chinwardestune	fol. 91b
Sparkeforda	fol. 352b	Spercheforde	fol. 95
Kaiuert	fol. 384	Chaiuert	fol. 97b
Pokintuna (x 2)	fol. 429b	Pochintune (x 2)	fol. 93b

The use of the letter *k* was rare but not unknown in both OE and old French.³

The discrepancies between the place-name forms of Exon and DB are, therefore, not necessarily an obstacle to the acceptance of the dependance of DB on Exon. In fact they offer a very interesting field for philological analysis, for by comparing them it is possible to study, in a large number of examples, at least something of the process by which the DB forms were achieved. The possibilities offered by such an analysis have not been

¹ von Feilitzen, p. 112, Pope, § 701.

² Ibid. p. 107, cf. Pope, §§ 690, 1209.

³ Ibid. p. 109.

exploited here and consequently only very tentative conclusions can be offered. Briefly these are that *Exon* was apparently the work of scribes some of whom were unfamiliar with English, presumably Frenchmen or Normans. The orthographic peculiarities of *Exon* cannot all be said to be due to French influence, but the association of such fairly certain French characteristics as prosthetic *e-* before *s* plus *a consonant* with others, less definitely French, such as the unvoicing of final-*d* to *-t* supports the supposition that the latter were in fact due to French influence.

The tendency in *DB* to remove these and replace a more normal OE orthography implies, as do the corrections made in *DB*, that its scribes were familiar with OE orthography and probably included Englishmen. Von Feilitzen has himself suggested the possibility that "native scribes may occasionally have been employed in the compilation of the returns", but adds that there is also "the possibility that in the twenty years that had elapsed since the Conquest and the time of the Survey some of the Norman clerks may have acquired a working knowledge of Anglo-Saxon orthography and of the traditional spelling of some of the more common personal names".¹ This comparison of *Exon* and *DB* suggests that English scribes, or Normans who had familiarized themselves with English, were employed in the final stages of the Domesday enquiry as well as in the compilation of the "original returns". It may further be argued that such corrections as are made in *DB* would have come more naturally to Englishmen than to foreigners who had learnt the language. A further point is that where *DB* does not consistently alter the orthography of *Exon*, for example, both *Exon* and *DB* use *ch* for (*k*) before *e* and *i*, we are dealing with a general characteristic. As it cannot be suggested that this example was a native development it seems probable that it was a very generally accepted Anglo-Norman convention.

Exon is in many ways similar to volume two of Domesday Book, which is sometimes known as Little Domesday Book and is here referred to as LDB. Both are written in single columns

¹ von Feilitzen p. 7, n. 1.

in several hands that differ from the set hand of DB. Both contain categories of information not included in DB, both use similar formulae not used in DB and neither is such a tidy manuscript as DB. It has in fact been suggested that they are both local rearrangements of the "original returns" of the Domesday enquiry and that while Exon was further condensed into DB, LDB was for some reason not so treated.¹

If the place-names of LDB are studied the first characteristic that is noticed is that, as in Exon, many are inflected. For example :

- fol. 9b in Slamondesheia tenet . . .
- fol. 10b Wareleiam tenuit Guert . . .
- fol. 31 Fifhidam tenet Ricardus . . .

In this LDB may be contrasted with DB where far fewer names are inflected, the normal forms there being, for example :

fol. 2b Tarentefort, Hagelei, Elesford, Middeltune, Middeltun, Fareshant.

Von Feilitzen remarks that LDB "preserves a greater number of traditional OE spellings than" DB.² In his discussion of particular personal names he places the forms found in the Domesday texts in order of development, and in many cases the first forms quoted come from LDB, for example :

OE Éadnoð; *Ætnod, Ætnodus, Ednoth* from LDB followed by other forms such as *Ednod* from DB.

OE Lēofsiȝe; *Leofsi, Leofsīus* from LDB followed by *Lefsī*, etc. from DB.

Cf. also *Ēadmund, Ēadrīc, Lēofrīc, Lēofwīne, Ulfkell, Ùhtræd, Wulfhēah*, etc.

In one respect the place-names of LDB are strikingly similar to those of Exon. In both manuscripts there is a tendency to unvoice final *-d* to *-t*. LDB contains 413 names with OE *ford* as a final element. Of these 200 have the form *-forda* but of the remainder only 41 preserve *-d* while 172 have *-t*. This may be contrasted with DB where of the 747 such names, 194 do not end in *-d* but generally have the form *-forde*, of the remainder 536 preserve *-d* while there are only 17 cases of *-fort*, these being in eight counties.

It is, however, not possible to say, because of this preponderance of unvoiced final *-d* in LDB, that it exhibits more French

¹ By V. H. Galbraith, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii (1942), 161-77.

² von Feilitzen, p. 6.

influence than DB. The critical test of that influence is the occurrence of prosthetic *e-* before *s* plus a consonant. LDB has fewer cases of this than might be expected, for example :

Exon has 33 place-names in *St-*; and 61 in *Est-*,
 DB has 550 place-names in *St-*; and 170 in *Est-*,
 LDB has 182 place-names in *St-*; and 35 in *Est-*.

LDB has, therefore, a greater proportion of *St-* names than *Est-* names and cannot be compared with Exon in this respect.

The orthography of LDB is certainly different from that of DB. For example, it has 41 place-names with initial *Ph-* for *F-*, while Exon and DB have none. It has 121 place-names with initial *K-* while in DB there are only 13 and in Exon only 6. As shown above DB tended to alter Exon's (-)k- to (-)ch-, so there is in this a slight parallel between LDB and Exon although it is only slight. Von Feilitzen explains the use of the symbols *-st-* for OE *-ht-* as due to Anglo-Norman influence and has calculated that there are in personal names 220 examples of this in Exon, 63 in LDB and 111 in DB.¹

These orthographical peculiarities of LDB are not necessarily indicative of direct French scribal influence, although they are clear evidence of a different scribal tradition from that of DB. No satisfactory explanation of this differing tradition can be offered here. It is possible that the scribes of LDB had acquired certain habits such as the unvoicing of final *-d* to *-t* from Continental scribes, but it is also possible that the scribal tradition of LDB was native. It is, however, clear that the orthography of LDB deserves close consideration.

This orthographical analysis of the three main Domesday texts shows that the compilation of Domesday Book was not, linguistically, a simple matter. Zachrisson's view that "from a linguistic point of view we have to look upon Domesday Book as an essentially Norman and French work", accepted by von Feilitzen, needs revision.²

Philologists, in discussing the orthography of Domesday Book, have explained the French influence it exhibits by the

¹ von Feilitzen, pp. 121-2. Cf. Pope, §§ 378, 1178, 1216.

² R. E. Zachrisson, *A Contribution to the Study of Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place Names* (Lund, 1909), p. 60, cf. von Feilitzen, p. 8.

assumption that the scribes responsible were generally French. Zachrisson wrote: "This (French) influence culminates in Domesday Book, where English place names are recorded by French clerks on the oral evidence of English and French jurors. . . ."¹ His pupil, von Feilitzen, has expressed the same opinion: "Though . . . there is the possibility that English scribes may occasionally have been employed by the Domesday commissioners and in the royal chancery, the philological as well as the historical evidence leaves no doubt that the vast majority of the clerks responsible . . . must have been Normans."²

It has been suggested above that Englishmen played a large part in the final stage of the compilation of DB. There is also evidence that the early stages of the enquiry preserved much better place-name forms than those found in DB. This would not prove that Englishmen were responsible for these stages as well although it increases the probability that this was the case. It does, however, show that the process by which the place-name forms of DB were achieved was very complicated.

One of the most important texts deriving from the early stages of the Domesday enquiry is the *Inquisitio Eliensis*, an account of the estates held or claimed by the Abbey of Ely in Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, Hertfordshire, Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk.³ It is preserved in three manuscripts, A, B, and C. B and C are independent copies of one exemplar, A is a copy of B. Von Feilitzen noticed that IE(B) and IE(C) "frequently preserve the late OE forms practically intact, whereas the spellings of A . . . are more worn down".⁴ But as he accepted Round's explanation of the sources of IE, that is that for Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex it derived from LDB, which has worse forms than IE, he was forced to conclude that the better forms in IE are due to corrections made by the scribe(s) of IE.⁵ In fact Round himself thought that IE incorporated corrections and

¹ R. E. Zachrisson, "The French Element", *Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names* (English Place-Name Society, vol. i, pt. i, 1929), pp. 98-9.

² von Feilitzen, p. 8.

³ N. E. S. A. Hamilton, *op. cit.* pp. 97-191. Referred to here as IE.

⁴ von Feilitzen, p. 10.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 8, n. 1.

additions to the information found in its source.¹ Von Feilitzen writes : "The fact that the orthography of English names in IE (B, C), which is held to be copied from the actual Domesday returns, shows a definitely OE character hardly warrants the conclusion that the documents on which it is based were drawn up by English scribes. If the Ely clerks, who were most probably Englishmen, excerpted or copied an Anglo-Norman return they would naturally try to restore the familiar OE forms of place- and personal-names."² He refers to Round in support of his claim that IE "is held to be copied from the actual Domesday returns". In fact Round is here only speaking of the Cambridgeshire section of IE; for Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex he argued that its source was LDB.

LDB was, however, not the source of IE for Norfolk and Suffolk. For these counties IE contains information not found in LDB.³ Round thought that such information was supplied by the scribe of IE, but a detailed comparison of the two texts shows that for these two counties the source of IE was arranged in a different way from LDB and it has been suggested⁴ that the best explanation is that for these counties IE and LDB had the same ultimate source, a rearrangement of the "original returns". It is therefore unnecessary to argue that the name forms of IE are an improvement on those of its source, which may well have had better forms than LDB. It is possible that these were better preserved in IE than in LDB.

It is, unfortunately, impossible to prove that such corrections or improvements did not take place, but there are some indications that when the various texts were copied the names were corrupted rather than corrected.

There is no reason to doubt Round's suggestion that for Cambridgeshire, DB, IE and the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis* (here referred to as ICC) had the same source, the "original returns" of the Domesday Enquiry.⁵ The ICC is a twelfth-century manuscript and is in many ways a bad text, its

¹ J. H. Round, *Feudal England* (1895), pp. 130-3.

² von Feilitzen, p. 8, n. 1.

³ C. Johnson, *Victoria History of the County of Norfolk*, ii, 4, 134-8.

⁴ By the present writer, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxx (1955), 187-9.

⁵ Round, op. cit. pp. 8, 135-9.

names frequently being corrupt. But it sometimes preserves a slightly better name form than DB. For example :

- (i) ICC p. 23 *Wratinga*; DB fols. 190b, 195b, 196b, 198, 199 *Waratinge* for Wrating. Cf. PNCa 121-2 where other early forms point to the first element OE *wraett*.
- (ii) ICC p. 32 *Wicham*; DB fols. 191, 193b, 196b × 2, 198 *Wicheham* for West Wickham. Cf. PNCa 112.
- (iii) ICC p. 43 *Trippelaue*; DB fols. 191, 197 *Trepeslau*, fol. 199 *Trepeslai* for Thriplow. Cf. PNCa 90.

Sometimes IE (B) or (C) and ICC agree in a better form than DB. For example :

- (i) ICC p. 3 *Sneileuuelle*; IE (B, C) p. 101 *Sneillewelle*; DB fol. 199 *Snellewelle* for Snailwell. Cf. PNCa 195-6 where other early forms point to OE *snaegel* as the first element.
- (ii) ICC p. 19 *Westlai*; IE (B, C) p. 104 *Westlai*; DB fols. 190b, 195b, 197b, 202 *Weslai* for Westley Waterless. Cf. PNCa 120.
- (iii) ICC p. 66 *Meldeburna*; IE (B, C) p. 109 *Meldeburna*; DB fols. 191b, 193b, 198b *Melleburne*, fol. 194b *Melleborne* for Melbourn. Cf. PNCa 58 where other early forms show that the *-d-* is etymological.
- (iv) ICC p. 94 *Ramtona*; IE (B) p. 112 *Ramtuna*, (C) *Rāptune*; DB fol. 201 *Rantone* for Rampton. Cf. PNCa 183.

The superiority of IE and ICC over DB in these examples is slight, but if it is argued that the forms in IE are the result of improvements made by the scribe of IE, this argument must also apply to ICC. The numerous bad forms in ICC give little support to any such suggestion that ICC corrected these few names independently of IE. A more reasonable explanation is that the source of both IE and ICC had better forms than DB and that these forms are better preserved in IF. than in DB or ICC.

The argument that the early stages of the Domesday enquiry preserved much better name forms than those in DB is supported by an examination of other manuscripts deriving from the early stages of the same enquiry in other counties. In fact, all these "Domesday Satellites" contain many name forms that are better than those of DB, even though most of the texts are late copies containing independent corruptions.

The Domesday Monachorum of Christ Church, Canterbury (here referred to as D Mon)¹ contains several sections that are related

¹ Edited by D. C. Douglas for the Royal Historical Society (1944).

to the Domesday enquiry and these are all in a hand that may be dated paleographically about 1100.¹ The relations between some of the "Domesday" sections of this manuscript and Domesday Book have not been determined, and although any attempt to do this will have to take name forms into account, a discussion of these cannot be dissociated from a detailed analysis of the manuscripts and their arrangement which would be out of place here. Only two of these sections will, therefore, be considered.

- (i) D Mon fols. 2^v-5; pp. 81-95 in Douglas' edition. An account of the Kentish estates of the Archbishop and the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury.
- (ii) D Mon fols. 5^v-7; pp. 99-104 in Douglas' edition. A list of almost all the Domesday estates in Kent, other than those dealt with in (i) above and those of the Bishop of Rochester, beginning *Rex tenet Derteford*.

It has been argued that the date of the first section is 1087 but that this copy "cannot have been written down at earliest before the end of 1089".² Professor Douglas has shown that this section and the equivalent parts of DB have a common source and he suggested that this source was the "original returns".³ Many of the place-name forms in this section are very much better than their equivalents in DB. For example:

<i>D Mon</i>		<i>DB</i>	<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
Bixle . . p. 86		Bix . . fol. 3	Bexley. KPN 134 <i>Byxlea, Bixlea</i>
Sunderhersce p. 87		Sondresse . . fol. 3	Sundridge. PNK 69. <i>Sunderhirse, Sunderersce</i>
Mellingettes p. 87		Metlinges . . fol. 3	Malling. KPN 253-4 <i>Meallinges, (of) meallingan</i>
Boctune . . p. 91		Boltone . . fol. 4	Boughton Malherbe. PNK 203 Malherbe. PNK 203
Langeport . . p. 92		Lamport . . fol. 4b	Old Langport. PNK 483-4
Lenham . . p. 93		Lerham . . fol. 4b	Lenham. KPN 94-5 <i>Lean(a)ham</i>
Freningham p. 95		Forningeham fol. 4	Farningham. KPN 326-7 <i>Frinningaham</i>

Besides such organic differences the place-names in this

¹ D. C. Douglas, *D Mon*, p. 3.

² Ibid. p. 23, n. 3.

³ Ibid. pp. 16-21.

section of D Mon are often orthographically much closer to the traditional OE forms than those in DB. For example :

<i>D Mon</i>		<i>DB</i>	<i>Modern forms etc.</i>	
Stursæte .	p. 81	Estursete .	fol. 3b	West Gate. KPN 164 <i>Stursete</i>
Stutinges .	p. 83	Estotinges	fol. 4	Stowting. KPN 324-5 <i>Stuting</i>
Otteford .	p. 87	Otefort .	fol. 3	Otford. KPN 90-1 <i>Otteford</i>
Liveland .	p. 93	Leuelant .	fol. 4	Leaveland. PNK 286
Godmæresham	p. 90	Gomersham	fol. 5	Godmersham. KPN 145 from OE <i>Godmær</i> plus <i>hām</i>
Earhede .	p. 86	Erhede .	fol. 3	Erith. KPN 17 from OE <i>ear</i> plus <i>hāp</i>
Fleotes .	p. 83	Fletes .	fol. 3b	Fleet. KPN 83 from OE <i>fleot</i>

The accuracy, it might be termed archaism, of this section of D Mon is probably due to its source containing better forms than DB. Some of the forms cited might be due to scribes familiar with OE orthography and where the differences between D Mon and DB cannot be explained in this way it could be argued that the Canterbury scribe drew on his knowledge of the estates of his church. Such explanations seem unlikely.

The text of this section of D Mon contains variant forms of important place-names, e.g.

- (i) *Limiuuarlethe* (p. 84), *Limiuarled* (p. 91), *Limiuarlæd* (p. 92), *Limvuarlæd* (p. 92), *Limwarlæd* (pp. 92, 93).
- (ii) *Wiwarleth* (p. 85), *Wiuuarlæd* (p. 92).
- (iii) *Estrege* (p. 88), *Æstrege* (p. 89), *Æstraie* (p. 90).

The word " lathe " appears in the following forms : *lest* (p. 85), *led* (p. 86), *læth* (p. 89), *læd* (p. 90), *letd* (p. 91). The rubrics of D Mon frequently differ from the names in the text, e.g.

- De Teneham ; Teneham, Tenham* (p. 85).
- De Derente ; Darente* (p. 88).
- De Munketune ; Munchetun* (p. 89).
- De Heðe et Saltwde ; Hede, Hedȝ, Saltwode* (p. 93).
- De Burricestune ; Burgericestune* (p. 95).

These variations imply that when this manuscript was written there was no particularly correct form for many of these names and that scribes were able to take considerable liberties (from the view point of traditional OE orthography) and still preserve forms that are strikingly better than those in DB.

An examination of the other section of D Mon increases the probability that the early stages of the Domesday enquiry had good place-name forms. In this the Kentish estates of tenants-in-chief other than the Archbishop, Christ Church, and the Bishop of Rochester, are arranged, with few exceptions, by sitting tenants and the only information given is the tenant's name, the name of the estate and its assessment in sulungs and yokes. Professor Douglas considered this section to be derived from DB but this is unlikely.¹ It includes some information not in DB and seems to record an earlier state of affairs than DB.² It clearly derives from an earlier stage of the enquiry.

Several place-name forms in this section are better than those in DB, for example :

<i>D Mon</i>		<i>DB</i>		<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
Wodnesberga . . .	p. 101	Gollesberge . .	fol. 11	Woodnesborough. PNK 586. <i>Wodnes-</i>
Trulege . . .	p. 102	Treuelai . .	fol. 10	Throwley. PNK 298 <i>T(h)rulege</i>
Suealesclue . . .	p. 103	Soaneclue . .	fol. 10	Swalecliffe. KPN 281 DB form unique
Marcword . . .	p. 103	Marourde . .	fol. 14	Mereworth. KPN 188 <i>Mæreweorðe</i> The c of D Mon is probably a scri- bal error for e
Lenham . . .	p. 100	Lertham . .	fol. 12	Lenham. KPN 94 <i>Lean(a)ham</i>
Herebrichtestune .	p. 101	Herbretitou . .	fol. 8	Harbilton. PNK 211-12. From OE <i>Herebeorht</i> and <i>ingtūn</i>
Grauesand . . .	p. 102	Grauesham . .	fol. 7b	Gravesend. PNK 100 DB form unique
Boxelei . . .	p. 100	Boseleu . .	fol. 8b	Boxley. PNK 133 <i>Boxle(e), Boxle(g)a</i>
Blen . . .	p. 103	Blehem . .	fol. 14	Blean. KPN 63 <i>Blean</i>

In a few cases DB has a better form than this section of D Mon, for example :

<i>D Mon</i>		<i>DB</i>		<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
Resce . . .	p. 101	Riesce . . .	fol. 7	Ryarsh. PNK 149-50 <i>Reiersce, Riesse</i> from OE <i>ryge</i> plus <i>ersc</i>
Lellesdune . . .	p. 102	Ledesdune . .	fol. 7b	Luddesdown. KPN 244 <i>Hludesduna, Lodesdone</i>

¹ D. C. Douglas, *D Mon*, p. 27, n. 7.

² Cf. P. H. Sawyer, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxx (1955), 194 and n. 3.

and sometimes both are wrong :

Latindune . .	p. 103	Latintone . .	fol. 9b	Nackington. KPN 348-9 Apart from these and one other, <i>Ratin(g)dune</i> , all have <i>N-</i>
Warwintune . .	p. 100	Warwintone . .	fol. 12	Garrington. PNK 523-4 Apart from these all have <i>G-</i>

The fact that this section of D Mon has, besides a number of better forms than DB, some errors suggests that its source had better forms than DB. There is, in this section, less plausibility in the argument of correction because these estates lay all over Kent and were not the property of Christ Church or the Archbishop.

Kent is very rich in Domesday texts ; there are, besides those in D Mon, two that come from St. Augustine's, Canterbury. One of these has been printed by Ballard with the title *An Eleventh Century Inquisition of St. Augustine's, Canterbury*.¹ It is preserved in the White Book of St. Augustine's, a thirteenth century cartulary, and its editor argues that "it is a copy . . . of a copy made between 1100 and 1154 (or possibly 1124) of an independent compilation made in or before 1087 from the original returns"² of the Domesday enquiry. In spite of its lateness and its transmission through several copies it has many forms that are much better than those of DB. For example :

<i>Inq. Aug.</i>		<i>DB</i>		<i>Modern forms etc.</i>
Lenham . .	p. 2	Lertham . .	fol. 12	Lenham. KPN 94-5 <i>Leanaham, Lenham</i>
Wilrintun . .	p. 4	Wirentone . .	fol. 12	Wilderton. KPN 333 <i>Wilretona, Wilretun</i>
Garwynton . .	p. 16	Warwintone . .	fol. 12	Garrington. KPN 315 <i>Garwintun</i>
Swalclue . .	p. 18	Soaneclue . .	fol. 10	Swalecliffe. KPN 281 <i>Swalewanclifes, Swales- cliffe</i>
Elfgethetun . .	p. 19	Ælluetone . .	fol. 12b	Elvington. PNK 582-3

In his discussion of this last name Wallenberg wrote : "The origin of Elvington is clear from the *Inq Aug* form. It must be OE *Ælfgyp*, fem. pers. n. plus *tūn*."

¹ *British Academy Records of Social and Economic History*, vol. iv (1920), pt. ii. Referred to here as *Inq. Aug.* The forms quoted here have been checked in the manuscript

² *Ibid. p. xii.*

Sometimes the failure to compare the forms in DB with those in Inq Aug has led to mistakes. For example, DB refers to *Eduuard de Estan* (fol. 1b). Von Feilitzen identifies this as Stone on the principle that the initial *E-* is prosthetic.¹ Inq Aug (p. 33), however, has *Edward de Terstane* showing that the place was Teston (cf. PNK 166-7) and this is confirmed by DB fol. 8b where Edward is given as the pre-conquest tenant of Teston. The accuracy of Inq Aug is also shown in its personal names. Thus where DB (fol. 1b) has *Aluuinus (hor interlined)*, Inq Aug has *Alfwyn horn* (p. 33) and is closer to the OE form of this name *Ælfwine*. Similarly Inq Aug has *Edgeth de Eselholte* (p. 33) for OE *Ēadgȳð* where DB has *Edid de Aisiholte* (fol. 1b; cf. KPN 293 where other early forms of this place-name include *Hæselholte*).

Another St. Augustine's text, not published, also shows forms better than DB. This is the *Noticia terrarum Sancti Augustini* contained in the same cartulary as Inq Aug.² Ballard knew it but thought it derived from Inq Aug. This is not so. Its place among the Domesday texts is difficult to determine but it is quite clear that its source was an earlier stage of the Domesday enquiry than DB. Some of its forms are startlingly good. For example, *Aschmieresfeld* (fol. 15^v) for Ashenfield where DB has *Esmerefel* (fol. 12), and Inq Aug has *Ethemesis-felde* (p. 5). Wallenberg, PNK 550, was not aware of this form but suggested that it might contain the OE personal name **Æscmær*.

All these Kentish texts, therefore, support the argument that the early stages of the Domesday enquiry had better place-name forms than DB itself. This does not necessarily mean that the "original returns" were compiled by English scribes. Von Feilitzen's suggestion, quoted above, that Norman scribes could have acquired a working knowledge of Anglo-Saxon orthography is relevant here. We shall probably never know where these scribes came from, but we have no cause to be certain that they were foreigners. The apparent accuracy of the place-name forms in the "original returns" would also be consistent with

¹ von Feilitzen, p. 237, n. 3.

² PRO Exchequer (K.R.) Misc. Books, vol. 27, from fol. 14^v.

the suggestion of Professor Galbraith that these returns were themselves based on documents.¹

This examination of the place-names of the Domesday manuscripts, although not exhaustive, does show that from a linguistic point of view the compilation of Domesday Book was not a simple matter. Each stage resulted in an increase of error. Thus, Exon has many names that are mistranscribed in DB, LDB "preserves a greater number of traditional spellings than" DB and, if the above argument is accepted, the "original returns" were more reliable than these later stages.

Domesday Book has attracted the attention of philologists not only as a source of English place-name forms but also as the first text of Anglo-Norman. The French influence found in the final product of the enquiry, Domesday Book, is not necessarily to be attributed to the "original returns" nor are these characteristics consistently evidenced in the later stages of the making of Domesday Book.

There is much to be learnt about late eleventh-century orthography and phonology from the Domesday manuscripts but these ought to be treated as a group and not as a collection of separate sources. The name forms of the "satellite texts" are important not simply as variants of those in Domesday Book but as evidence for the way in which the names recorded by the Domesday commissioners or their scribes were copied and recopied, probably by different scribes until the final, and most familiar, forms of Domesday Book were produced. It may also be suggested that the later abbreviations and copies of Domesday Book might prove a profitable field for an investigation of subsequent orthographical and phonological developments in English. In these it is possible to study, not the written forms of names as pronounced locally, but the later treatment of determined name forms.

¹ *Eng. Hist. Rev.* lvii (1942), 171-7. Cf. C. Johnson, *Victoria History of the County of Norfolk*, ii, 2-4.

THE MANCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND THE INCREASING FOREIGN COMPETITION TO LANCASHIRE COTTON TEXTILES, 1873-1896

By ROLAND SMITH, B.A., Ph.D.

DURING the last quarter of the nineteenth century foreign textile industries developed rapidly enough to begin to overhaul the position of the United Kingdom as the sole large-scale world producer of cotton textiles,¹ and this overall increase in the volume of world cotton textiles production, without a corresponding expansion in international trade for cotton goods,

¹ My Ph.D. Thesis, "The Lancashire Cotton Industry and the Great Depression 1873-1896" (Birmingham, 1954), has plotted in much closer detail the rapid development of foreign cotton textile industries and the increased competitive world-market conditions for the sale of cotton textiles which were common to the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Suffice it now to summarize briefly the changes in the distribution of world mill spindlage during the second half of the nineteenth century in the Table below :

STATISTICS OF WORLD MILL SPINDLEAGE

	1846		1876		1894	
	Spindles (in mill.)	Per cent. of total	Spindles (in mill.)	Per cent. of total	Spindles (in mill.)	Per cent. of total
Great Britain	17.5	63.0	39.0	57.4	45.2	49.18
Europe	7.6	27.5	19.5	28.6	27.3	29.7
United States	2.5	9.5	9.5	14.0	15.8	17.18
India	—	—	—	—	3.6	3.94
Total	27.6	100	68.0	100	91.9	100

(Source : *Economist Annual Commercial Review*, 1894)

provoked more intensely competitive market conditions in this class of trade than had existed at any time previously in the century.¹ Furthermore, foreign discrimination against Lancashire cottons by tariffs or other means—implying an abandonment of free trading principles by several foreign governments—favourably assisted foreign producers in their initial competition with Lancashire goods.

It is the purpose of this article to discover whether or not the changing position of the Lancashire cotton industry, *vis-à-vis* world cotton textile trade during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, produced any significant alteration in the prevailing "Manchester" support for free trading principles and whether, during the seventies or later in the century, the Lancashire industry began to call upon Her Majesty's Government for greater assistance in dealing with those countries where imports of Lancashire cottons were being affected adversely by newly imposed Protectionist legislation.

Fortunately for these purposes a cross-section of the Lancashire cotton business community—merchants, shippers, spinners, and manufacturers among others—attended the meetings of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, an especially powerful cotton trade organization for most of the nineteenth century, intended to concern itself only with matters of trade affecting the interests of the United Kingdom cotton industry. It is in the records of these private Chamber meetings that we are enabled to discover what exactly the Lancashire businessmen officially proposed in order to maintain their own trading position against the rising foreign textile competitors.²

¹ Whereas in the first half of the nineteenth century some 55 per cent. of world cotton goods production entered into international trade, in 1884 the proportion had declined to little more than one-third. Furthermore, from 1880 until 1913 World production of cotton goods increased two and one half times, whilst World trade in cottons doubled; the proportion of production destined for export fell from one-third to 28 per cent. of the total. (See R. Robson, "The Location and Development of the Cotton Industry", *Journal of Industrial Economics*, April, 1953.)

² It is not the intention here to construct from the Chamber Minutes a full history of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce during the last quarter of the nineteenth century; as the activities of the Chamber were multifarious, we shall be concerned only with those which bear directly upon the theme outlined.

I

The demands for tariff reform and a return to protection made by several sections of the United Kingdom business community after 1870 show a definite time relationship with the arrival of increased competitive conditions for the sale of British goods in home and foreign markets.

There had always been some sectional criticism of the working of free trade during the mid-nineteenth century, but mainly by Conservatives who were intent upon sniping at the Liberals and not unduly serious about making definite proposals to change the fiscal system; the great forward movement of protection in the United Kingdom did not start until the late seventies, when, for some sections of the business community at least, free trade could be said to be losing its former charm. The slowing down in the momentum of increase of United Kingdom exports—measured either by value or by quantitative terms—whilst imports continued to increase, was the chief cause of alarm; it was argued by the tariff reformers¹ that foreign protectionist legislation was beginning to deprive British export industries of some share in the demand for manufactured goods from overseas markets, whilst foreign merchants and manufacturers were permitted to sell freely in the United Kingdom or Colonial markets.²

But the agitation intended to promote the case for tariff protection was neither haphazard nor unorganized; in 1881 a National Fair Trade League was founded in London, and other branches soon appeared in all parts of the United Kingdom.³ Their written aims were “to agitate for such fiscal readjustments as shall prevent the products of foreign states, which refuse to

¹ See the whole set of Reports from different British industries collected in the *Tariff Commission, 1905*.

² According to W. Schlotte, *British Overseas Trade 1760 until 1938* (translated by W. H. Chaloner and W. O. Henderson, 1952), pp. 66–8, the net imports of finished manufactured goods as a percentage of total United Kingdom imports rose from 6·9 per cent. in 1853–9 to 16·7 per cent. in 1890–9.

³ Other Fair Trade Associations beside the National Fair Trade League are mentioned in B. H. Brown, *The Tariff Reform Movement in Great Britain, 1881–1895* (1943), pp. 15–17.

deal with Great Britain in fair trade, from unduly competing with the products of home labour". All seemed prepared for the renewal of the former battles fought in the first half of the century between the supporters of free trade and the protectionists.

The Manchester Chamber of Commerce could not avoid open combat with the Fair Traders, for after all it was in some of the earliest meetings of the Chamber during the eighteen-twenties that many of the arguments about free trade had first been discussed ; it was in these same meetings, too, that the difficulties of ever implementing a free trade fiscal policy were thrashed out in private and in detail long before Manchester gave its powerful support to the commercial reforms implemented nationally in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Manchester, therefore, had a personal as well as a vested business interest in seeking to maintain free trade at home and an international free trading system after 1870. Lancashire cottons were still for the most part the cheapest in the world and, given free market conditions, they could compete effectively with those of any other nation ; consequently, the Manchester Chamber directors, representing the rank and file cotton businessmen, sought continuously to maintain free international trading and to frustrate all attempts by foreign states to adopt tariff protection. In Europe, where some governments had never accepted free trade in all commodities, the Chamber directors sought a continuous reduction in the duties which remained, and from time to time vigorously protested against proposed increases.

It was to be expected, therefore, that the Manchester Chamber directors would be particularly attentive to the details of all tariff bargaining taking place after 1870 in which the United Kingdom was involved. In 1870, for instance, the Manchester Chamber directors urged the British and Spanish Governments to seek the abolition of the "highly prohibitive duties which exist as obstacles to any extension of trade with the Peninsula". In Manchester's opinion, "the people of both countries [i.e. Spain and Portugal] are favourable to a reduction of duties and if the means for free commercial intercourse were

introduced they would be appreciated and lead to a full and legitimate expansion of trade with those countries."¹

No tangible results were achieved by the Manchester protests and the duties remained in force. Moreover, in 1877 the Spanish and Portuguese Governments each contemplated increasing the level of their tariff duties, and the Manchester Chamber again petitioned Britain's Foreign Secretary to act on behalf of Manchester merchants trading in the Spanish Peninsula by opposing "any increased hindrance in the way of trading intercourse with Spain and Portugal".² But once again the two foreign governments paid no attention to British protests and both proceeded to increase their tariffs.

The complete list of Manchester protests tendered by way of the British Foreign Secretary to foreign governments against retained tariff impositions or proposed departures from free trading principles would be too long to detail; they included protests to the Italian Government against the retention of tariffs on bleached yarns, against the increase in Greek and Turkish tariffs in November 1878 and again in December 1884, against the increased Russian, Italian, and Austrian tariffs in July 1887, and representation to the British Colonial Office in February 1891 in protest against the imposition of a 10 per cent. duty upon cotton textile imports into the Gold Coast.

It was not always a one-sided delivery of official views between the Manchester Chamber and the British Government, for very often the Government themselves made the initial approach to the Chamber; in fact, at the opening of the final quarter of the nineteenth century there still existed very close co-operation and a community of interest in all matters between the Government of the day and the Lancashire cotton industry.

In 1871, when the French Government were desirous of scrapping the Cobden-Chevalier Commercial Treaty and increasing certain import duties, the Gladstone Government despatched the text of the French proposals to the Directors of the Manchester Chamber "requesting a detailed Memorandum

¹ The Proceedings of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce MSS. (hereafter abbreviated P.M.C.C.), 30 March 1870.

² P.M.C.C. 27 June 1877.

on how the changes in the French tariffs might affect the best interests of the cotton industry". The French had proposed "no change" in tariff duties for the import of iron, steel, coal, glass, pottery, fish, cheese, and beer, but duties upon textile raw materials would be increased in the following proportions:

- (i) By a 20 per cent. increase of duty on raw cotton.
- (ii) By a 15 per cent. increase of duty on silk.
- (iii) By a 10 per cent. increase of duty on flax.
- (iv) By a 15 per cent. increase of duty on linen.
- (v) An increase would also be proposed on the duties for the medium and fine cotton yarns—from 3 to 5 per cent.

In reply the Manchester Chamber condemned the French decision, for it "would have the effect of destroying the small trade at present existing and the present duty of 15 per cent. was already prohibitory of the import to France of cotton manufactures in general. That, whilst the fullest sympathy was manifested for France under her present difficulties, it was the general belief that her only hope lay in the direction of following the free trade example of this country."¹ It was made clear to a Chamber deputation which visited the Board of Trade that, "the French, under Article 9 of the 1860 Commercial Treaty had the power to impose higher duties on the imports of foreign manufactures in case they should at the same time impose higher duties on the importation of raw materials for their own internal consumption—the expressed condition being that the increased duties shall in no degree be protective." Sir Louis Mallet, one of the leading Board of Trade officials, told the deputation that the "anticipations which were once entertained as to the growth of free trade principles in France, have certainly not been realized; in France great ignorance prevails and economic laws are almost unknown. There is no public opinion or the educating influence of open and public discussion which in this Country has so materially assisted in the dissemination of sound views."²

Mr. Mason, who led the Chamber deputation, reminded Sir Louis Mallet of the sudden growth of the French cotton industry competing with Lancashire in the French home market, and he

¹ P.M.C.C. 27 September 1871.

² P.M.C.C. 31 October, 1871.

complained that "the duties imposed upon certain kinds of our yarn and manufactures under the Treaty were made owing chiefly to the improvements adopted by the French in the management of their cotton trade".

The majority of Chamber members were, in fact, strongly opposed to these French protectionist moves and they expressed their feelings in two forthright Resolutions despatched to the Gladstone Cabinet in October 1871. The first was directed at the French Government and "lamented that the French people are required to bear heavy taxation for the payment of interest on their great National Debt, and deeply regrets that with the beneficent results of the free trade policy of this country before their eyes, the French Government should think it necessary or desirable to fetter the interchange of Commerce with other nations"; the second was directed at the French people, but it contained a message for all trading nations, since it expressed the Manchester free traders' "emphatic condemnation of a policy having for its object the imposition of taxes for purely protectionist ends—a policy which is inimical to the true interests of this country".¹

These outspoken Manchester protests secured a brief postponement of the first French moves toward protection, but only twelve months later the details of a new Anglo-French Trade Agreement were again under discussion. Once the Treaty proposals were published, the Manchester Chamber joined along with the Bradford, Macclesfield and many other trade associations from the northern industrial towns in protest against them.² For example, the clause enabling the French "to have power to increase the duties on the products of any branch of industry by merely giving six months' notice and having the consent of the other Treaty signatories", was described by the Manchester Chamber as "mischievous".³

But these moves to increase tariff duties made by the French Republican Government were inspired by political as well as economic considerations. Isolated diplomatically, scorned by

¹ P.M.C.C. *op. cit.*

² P.M.C.C. 18 December 1872.

³ P.M.C.C. 30 October 1872.

the powerful Monarchical nations because of their Republican form of Government, and having recently borne a heavy military defeat at the hands of the Prussians in the Franco-Prussian war, the French drew in upon themselves and sought to become self sufficient from the rest of Europe in the matter of imported raw materials or manufactures. The policy was not always popular among French industrialists ; for instance, the French Chambers of Commerce wrote to the Manchester Chamber in 1873¹ expressing their "earnest desire to advance the principles of free trade and to sweep away the Protectionist clauses in the proposed Anglo-French Treaty of 1872".

Concerted opposition to any increase in French tariff duties led to an announcement by the French Government in 1874 that "they were content to retain the existing commercial arrangements without any move towards Protection". That contentment, however, was only temporary, and in 1880 commercial negotiations were re-opened between the Governments of the two countries after the French had intimated that they intended increasing the duties on several classes of British imports. Cotton textiles were included in this category and the Manchester Chamber directors reiterated their old protests² to the British and French Governments :

In the general tariff now under notice, instead of a reduction of duties, we find a very marked increase, and further, a change from the principle of ad valorem to that of a specific assessment so adroitly arranged by a grouping of classes, as practically to put an end to the possibility of the textile fabrics hitherto sent to France being thenceforth imported into that country. . . .

¹ Received by the Chamber directors, 30 June 1873. Some months later, the Manchester Chamber delivered an Address to the *People and Commercial Interests of France*, making it clear that, "The Manchester Chamber seeks not to meddle with the commercial policy of any other country beyond attempting to show by example and precept that Great Britain relies on the policy of Free Trade and will ever adhere to the principle of opening her ports to the ships of all nations and of subjecting her industries to the widest competition". (P.M.C.C. 22 November 1876).

² P.M.C.C. 27 April 1881. There were other Lancashire Trade Associations which opposed the French attempt at breaking up the mid-century era of Anglo-French free trade. The Bolton Employers' Association, for instance, despatched a strongly worded Memorial to both the British and French governments condemning any move toward protection. (*Minutes of the Bolton Employers' Association MS.*, 4 May 1881.)

Having regard to the distinctly protective nature of this new general tariff and to the little value which the French Government evidently places upon friendly relations with Great Britain or upon any further development of trade between the two countries, it is expedient to recommend to Her Majesty's Government the total and immediate abandonment of all Treaty negotiations with the French Government.

Negotiations on the possibility of changing tariff levels by agreement between the two countries were terminated forthwith.¹ They were re-opened, however, a few months later and in the following year the two countries were enabled to settle their commercial differences by the French Government granting the United Kingdom "most favoured nation" rights for the sale of British goods inside France.

Ten years later, in 1892, a new French tariff was evolved which fixed maximum and minimum scales of duty. In most cases it meant an increase in the old duties—especially for cotton textiles. In practice the new French tariffs were almost prohibitive and several British firms only found it possible to penetrate the French market by setting up mills in that country; indeed, one British textile firm invested so much of its capital in French spinning mills that its "French business had become more important than that in England".²

Without doubt, increased French tariffs, imposed contemporaneously with the growth of the "infant" French cotton industry, helped to accelerate the decline in Lancashire's cotton textile exports to France;³ moreover, the fears expressed by the Manchester Chamber directors in the seventies, that increased tariffs—whether imposed by the French or other European governments—along with advancing industrialization, would do

¹ The *Economist* was the only strong supporter of free trade in the United Kingdom which did not suggest the termination of the Anglo-French negotiations at this juncture.

² Tariff Commission; Textiles Report: Para. 79.

³ *British Cotton Yarns and Piece Goods Exports to France*.

<i>Cotton Yarns</i>		<i>Piece Goods</i>	
<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Value</i>
Annual average: (All boom year comparisons)			
1870-1872 = 3,850,000 lbs.	£447,000	7,763,000 sq. yds.	£1,530,000
1911-1913 = 4,817,333 lbs.	£483,455	3,598,566 sq. yds.	£401,951

(Source: *United Kingdom Trade and Navigation Accounts, 1870-1914*.)

something to reduce British textile exports to the European continent, in fact came true.¹

II

Of all the countries supplied with British cotton goods, the importance of those in the Far East was paramount throughout the last quarter of the nineteenth century. In 1876, for instance, 32·6 per cent. of all cotton yarns and 54·3 per cent. of all cotton cloths exported from the United Kingdom were sold in the Indian, Chinese and Japanese markets ; however, Lancashire's position was by no means secure, for this was also the period of early growth among the infant Asiatic textile industries intending to sell goods in markets long dominated by Lancashire.² In these conditions it was only to be expected that Far Eastern trade problems would monopolize much of the attention of the different Lancashire cotton trade associations and that of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce in particular, for in the latter body were many of the businessmen who handled Lancashire's Far Eastern trade. Their interest in the Far East was extended to include anything which bore even the faintest relationship to the capacity of

¹ *United Kingdom Annual Average Yarns and Piece Goods Exports to Europe.*

	Cotton Yarns (million lbs.)	Piece Goods (million sq. yds.)
1881-1885	138·1	409·0
1886-1890	129·5	385·8
1891-1895	115·4	295·3
1896-1900	108·3	289·6
1901-1904	83·1	279·8

(Source : *United Kingdom Trade and Navigation Accounts, 1870-1914.*)

² The Indian cotton spinning industry achieved a considerable export trade in yarns to China, Japan and South East Asia before the end of the century.

	Total Indian Yarn Exports. (million lbs.)	Total British Yarn Exports. (million lbs.)
1877	8·2	227·6
1893	162·9	236·1
1894	190·5	251·9

(Source : *A Report of the Trade of British India with British Possessions and Foreign Countries, 1894.*)

this area to maintain or increase its consumption of cottons. For instance, along with trade representatives of the various United Kingdom engineering industries, the Manchester Chamber supported the campaign for improved rail communications in India, since an extension of the Indian rail system would permit the speedy delivery of Lancashire cottons into the heart of the Indian continent which, until the end of the nineteenth century, remained relatively immune from intensive trading penetration by foreign merchants.¹ Indeed, the further opening up of the Indian market by the extension of rail services proved popular with all the Lancashire cotton trade associations as a means of terminating short-term depressed and unprofitable trading conditions for their industry. The cotton unions truly believed that "once railroads and waterway communications were further expanded in India we should soon be able to sell our cotton goods".² On all occasions the official Lancashire promptings made to the British Government to develop the Indian rail system reached a peak intensity during the periods of overseas famine or depressed and unprofitable trading for the British cotton industry, when everyone was impressed with the need for an extension of available markets.³

In March 1872 the Manchester Chamber members summarized their interest in Indian economic affairs in a lengthy

¹ See *The Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry, 1886*; particularly the evidence of Mr. G. Lord (President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce during 1885–1886). Mr. S. H. Hallett, addressing the Manchester Chamber (P.M.C.C. 6 April 1889), said: "An extension of the Indian rail system is a question of bread and butter for the people of Lancashire; it is a question which is bound up with the decrease or increase of your manufacturing, the future employment or destitution of your operatives."

² *The Cotton Factory Times*, 12 June 1885.

³ Partly as a result of the sustained United Kingdom pressure to develop the Indian rail system, the length of the rail track laid down in India trebled during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Indian Rail Track Construction

Date	Miles of Track	Capital Outlay (Rupees)
1876	6,833	109,365,000
1892	18,042	227,129,000

(Source : *Manchester Chamber of Commerce Monthly Record*, February 1894.)

Memorial¹ to the Indian Viceroy, the Rt. Hon. Lord Northbrook, only part of which is reproduced below :

That your Memorialists, having regard to the vast population of British India and the capabilities of the country for an increased consumption of European goods, or on the other hand, the natural capabilities of the soil of India for the supply of the wants of the country, view the result as disproportionate and unsatisfactory, leaving a wide field for further developments.

And your Memorialists have still to deplore the delay in the adoption of measures for the promotion of many agricultural improvements which would tend to increase the quantity and improve the quality of raw cotton and relieve the cotton trade from its dependence on America as its principal source of supply of the raw material.²

But despite the obvious goodwill toward India displayed in the above Memorial, Lancashire business interests were often inconsiderate of Indian economic progress, and, although at all times Lancashire took a fervent interest in Indian affairs, it was not always benevolent. Consider, by way of example, the long enduring debate which took place between the Manchester Chamber and the India Office regarding the Indian import duties.

Before the Indian Mutiny the duties upon cotton manufactures imported into India had varied from 3 to 5 per cent., the precise levy depending upon the grade and type of cloth. Increased and improved Government services in India after the Mutiny were responsible for an appreciable rise in Indian Government expenditure ; faced with the problem of meeting this expenditure, the India Office agreed to increase the level of duties imposed upon certain classes of cotton imports. Lancashire trade associations protested immediately and vigorously against the increased impositions, arguing that the duties formed a convenient protective shield for the growth of the Indian cotton industry. In fact, the Indian cotton industry grew rapidly through the sixties, with the result that Manchester merchants became alarmed at the increasingly competitive trading conditions for the sale of cotton goods in the Indian home market. In a Memorial despatched to the Prime Minister

¹ P.M.C.C. 27 March 1872.

² Later in the century and in another connection, one Lancashire Chamber director made the point that : "the true interests of India lie in the development of the Continent's vast agricultural resources, because the Indian population were unsuited to factory production". (J. C. Fielden, *The dangers surrounding the cotton trade*, 1889).

during 1874, the Chamber Directors described the Indian duties as "absolutely prohibitory to the trade in yarn and cloth of the coarse and low priced sorts"; furthermore, "the levying of duties when their effect is to afford protection to one portion of Her Majesty's subjects in India, to the disadvantage of another portion in England with whom they are brought into competition in trade, is inconsistent with the commercial policy of this country".¹ After the receipt of this Memorial a Special Tariff Committee was appointed to examine the effects of the import duties upon Lancashire's trade with India. In their report, the committee argued that, since Lancashire and Bombay mills produced entirely different types of cotton goods and were not really in close competition, there should be no alteration in the prevailing duties. Lancashire mills, so the committee explained, now sold to India more of the medium to fine goods, which could not yet be manufactured on a remunerative basis by the Indian textile producers, who concerned themselves predominantly with the manufacture of coarse goods.

Market evidence contradicts these findings; while it would have been true to say that few British cotton goods of the coarsest varieties were being sold in India, the changeover from Lancashire supplying India with the finer cottons rather than the more coarse varieties was a gradual process and one which began and continued throughout the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Certainly, in the seventies and for several years after, intense competition between British and Indian cotton goods' producers took place "at the margin of the coarse and medium quality goods trade"—that is, trading competition was virtually non-existent among the very coarse and the very fine cottons, but in the less coarse and medium grades competition between the two sets of manufacturers was extremely keen.²

Indian cotton manufacturers experimented many times before the end of the century with the bulk production of medium

¹ P.M.C.C. 28 January 1874.

² The bulk of Indian spun cotton yarn was of the very coarse variety—counts 6, 10 and 20; few British firms sold the 6 or 10 counts, but the trade in 20s remained important despite the increasing weight of Indian competition. (See *The Report of Trade with British India and British Possessions*, 1879.)

and finer cottons, but two technical drawbacks withheld a successful conclusion to their efforts. Firstly, the skill and technical experience required to spin or weave the finer goods was not as readily available among Indian operatives as it was in Lancashire, and secondly, it proved impossible to manufacture the finer goods from the poor quality locally-grown Indian raw cotton. The Indian millowners tried desperately to remedy this second deficiency by the importation of small quantities of the better quality American or Egyptian raw cotton, but an additional 5 per cent. duty was levied by the India Office upon all supplies of raw cotton imported into India for cotton yarn spinning and, by importing these alternative supplies, the Indian cotton spinners surrendered their cost advantage to the Lancashire competitors.

On each occasion when the Indian Tariff Acts came under review the Manchester Chamber would reiterate their reasons for the immediate remission of the duties imposed upon imported cotton manufactures. In effect, since the prices of British cotton goods of equivalent quality were cheaper or as cheap as those produced in Indian mills, the Lancashire trade associations were seeking a return to free trade in the Indian market in order to weight the balance of consumption in favour of Lancashire goods. During April 1876¹ the following four-point Memorandum was submitted to the India Office prior to the review of the Duties for that year :

1. That the Duties now levied are up to a certain point—that is on low yarns and piece goods—not only protective, but prohibitive and contrary to the commercial policy of Great Britain.
2. That in the interests of the Indian consumer they ought to be abolished as they exclude him from the advantage of competition and artificially raise the price of his clothing for the benefit of the Indian millowner.
3. The following affords an example of the unfair incidence of the Duty : a mill in Lancashire containing 700 looms will produce £2,000 worth of cloth weekly, the duty to be paid on this amount at 5 per cent. is £100 per week or a tax of £5,200 per annum on the Lancashire manufacturer who exports to India.
4. It is well known and admitted that the trade to India has of late years been carried on at a *mere* margin of profit ; and in some cases a loss has been all but inevitable.

¹ P.M.C.C. 19 April 1876.

Eventually, in the spring of 1878, the India Office agreed to exempt from duty the coarser varieties of cotton goods, which included unbleached T-cloths and coarse twist yarns below 20s count.¹ In the latter case it was argued officially, "that even if the finer British yarns were all exempted from duty, it would not lead to any noticeable increase in exports to India since there was little fine cloth weaving and, therefore, little demand in this part of the Empire".²

Lancashire manufacturers immediately expressed their deep disappointment with the Government's decision to exempt so few goods from duty, and the Manchester Chamber continued its campaign to convince the India Office of the need for total abolition. Fierce controversy was revived when the Secretary of State for India proposed an increase in the Indian import duties during 1894. Announcing this in the House of Commons, Mr. Fowler, the newly appointed Secretary of State for India, declared, "that the embarrassed condition of the finances and the certainty that the accounts of the present year and the estimates of the year 1894-5 showed a heavy deficit, placed the Government under the necessity of reducing expenditure wherever possible and of increasing income". The tariff changes took the form of a five per cent. increase in duty upon all imported piece goods and on all medium and fine spun cotton yarns over 20s count.³

¹ The calculated immediate effects of the changes in Indian Tariff levels :

	Twist Yarn			Grey Piece Goods		
	Duty free	Dutiable	Per cent. of free yarn	Duty free	Dutiable	Per cent. of free cloth
	lb.	lb.		yd.	yd.	
1879	2,546,636	30,655,316	7·67	374,360,464	534,259,669	41·2
1881	4,400,530	41,476,045	9·67	815,871,943	354,681,876	69·7

(Source : *Report of Trade of British India with British Possessions and Foreign Countries*, 1882, Cmd. 3139.)

British printed, dyed, and bleached piece goods imported into India in large quantities at this period were all subject to duty.

² The 1879 Report of Trade of British India with British Possessions and Foreign Countries.

³ For the immediate effects of the increased duties upon the export pattern of British cotton goods to India, see E. Helm, "The Indian Import Duties" (*Economic Journal*, 1896).

Lancashire trade associations again protested that the new tariff impositions were "contrary to the existing commercial policy of the United Kingdom and to the spirit of the earlier House of Commons resolutions on the necessity of freer Anglo-Indian trading conditions".

Twelve months before the increases were announced Lord Kimberley, who was then Secretary of State for India, had visited the Blackburn Chamber of Commerce and in his address to that body had declared : "there remains only one considerable source of revenue for India and I mention it at once with a thrill of horror—the idea of import duties. I merely mention it for the purpose of dismissing it. The industry of Lancashire and Yorkshire is prosecuted with great energy and it is one of which we are most proud and one which we ought in every conceivable manner to support and encourage."¹

Lord Kimberley, however, left the India Office early in March 1894, but the contents of his Blackburn speech were well remembered by many Lancashire businessmen. One of them was James Whittaker, a cotton cloth manufacturer and a director of the Blackburn Chamber of Commerce, who decided to campaign personally against the recent changes in the Indian import duties.² It was not long, however, before he was supported in his campaign by other cotton employers and by all the more important cotton union leaders.³

In May 1895 Whittaker led an Employers-Union deputation to the India Office⁴ and during the interview with the Secretary of State for India he enquired whether, in the light of Lord

¹ A full report of Lord Kimberley's speech is printed in the *Blackburn Times*, 22 June 1893.

² Whittaker's views are conveniently summarized in a pamphlet he himself wrote, *The Re-imposition of the Indian import duties on cotton goods and yarn*.

³ The cotton unions condemned the action of the House of Commons in supporting the proposal to increase the Indian import duties ; they condemned particularly "two Lancashire M.P.'s who voted for the increase even though they did not understand the matter". (*Cotton Factory Times*, 8 March 1895.)

⁴ In the nineties British workers and their representatives still identified their well-being with that of the trade in which they were engaged ; a worker employed by a firm whose business was affected by foreign competition was prepared to join with the employers in making joint protests for Government remedial action of one kind or another.

Kimberley's Blackburn speech, the increase in the import duties was altogether so vital for Indian financial solvency? He went on: "who are the people in India at present urging the imposition of these indirect taxes; in our opinion they are the millowners, small-scale capitalists and civil servants who wish to avoid any increase in direct taxation and were most indignant when cotton goods were not included among the increased import duties announced for 1892. They were, therefore, included in the new 1894 tariff list. The interest of the cotton spinner and the manufacturer in the United Kingdom is identified with the interest of the Indian consumer, and an injury cannot be done to the latter without it being reflected upon the former. Whatever contention there may be as to who pays this duty, one thing is certain and that is that the sum of 3,150,000 rupees per annum will be extracted from our exports of yarn and cloth to India. Whether this large sum is paid by the Indian consumer or by the British producer, the result must be alike, injurious to us."¹

Whittaker ended his statement with these well-chosen words: "to the development of the cotton industry in India by fair and legitimate means, Lancashire does not and never has objected. We have supplied India with our most improved machinery and our best workmen; but Lancashire does object to the fostering and protection of a competing industry in our Dependency at the expense of the same industry in the Mother Country. We have imposed order and peace in India and have pledged the credit of England in order to develop the resources of the country, and consequently, we have the right to expect that our trading relations with that country should be unimpeded."

Despite these many enquiries and contentions Fowler remained adamantly convinced that the import duties were a

¹ The increased duties weighed more heavily upon coarse cloth imports than the coarse yarn imports, and Elijah Helm, then Secretary of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, writing in the *Economic Journal* (op. cit. (1896)), claimed that "cloth manufacturers, particularly in Blackburn, were compelled to halt their machinery temporarily during 1895 and to seek alternative markets, whilst workpeople were deprived of their earnings".

necessity and organized agitation for their remission was continued by Lancashire trade associations into the early years of the twentieth century. But despite all the protests the duties remained. Earlier in the century there had been a time when the British Government would have reacted speedily to any change in Lancashire's trade opinions. Times were changing, however, and although Lancashire cotton still remained one of the most powerful industrial and political pressure groups within the United Kingdom, that power was becoming relatively less important than it had been.

III

Whilst protesting to the British Government against what they regarded as preferential tariff treatment for the Indian cotton industry, the Lancashire business community also recognized other factors which had assisted the Indian industry in their competition with Lancashire goods—the proximity of Indian mills to a vast home market capable of consuming an untold quantity of cotton goods, proximity to cheap supplies of raw cotton, adequate availability of low wage labour, and, finally, the competitive cost advantage secured from a currency based upon silver that had been recently depreciated relative to the value of gold. It was upon the last factor that members of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce concentrated their attention during the last few years of the nineteenth century, for it appeared to them that neither the cotton industry nor the British Government could do much to even up the advantages endowed by nature upon the Indian cotton industry, but they did have it within their power to remove the competitive cost advantage secured by the Indian millowners from the depreciation of silver, by establishing a bimetallic currency of gold and silver for the United Kingdom.

The advantages of bimetallism for the United Kingdom had first been argued before the Chamber directors during April 1879,¹ but the majority of those present still believed "that gold as a standard and unlimited legal tender, with subordinate and

¹ P.M.C.C. April 1879.

limited coinage of silver and copper as token money, is best adapted to the necessities and convenience of the country and should therefore be continued".

As Asiatic low cost competition in cotton textiles became more intensive after 1880, the Lancashire cotton community took a keener interest in currency matters and the Manchester Chamber supported the appointment of a Royal Commission in July 1885 charged "to enquire into the present relative position of Gold and Silver in their uses as money throughout the World".¹ But even though a majority of the Chamber members were prepared to support the Commission's appointment, the same majority remained undecided whether or not the depreciation of silver values had proved of any greater significance in favourably assisting the Indian cotton industry than other factors. Similarly, there were many cotton trade businessmen—both inside and outside the Manchester Chamber—who still opposed the arguments of the bimetallists.

Day by day, however, Lancashire support for the bimetallists increased, and there are two credible explanations of the popular dissemination of the involved financial arguments freely used by their supporters. First, the *Manchester Guardian* became the mouthpiece of the bimetallist cause and the newspaper editorials made great popular play with the involved bimetallist arguments; further, in 1886, a Bi-metallic League was founded by those who desired the implementation of a bi-metallic currency for the United Kingdom,² and the intentions of the League were to "disseminate financial information, to organize deliberate agitation and to urge upon the British Government the necessity of co-operating with other leading Nations for the establishment by International Agreement of the free coinage of gold and silver at a fixed rate".

Most of its leading members were Lancashire businessmen and it assembled its headquarters in Manchester. Sir William Houldsworth—Member of Parliament, Chamber Director, free

¹ P.M.C.C. 28 July 1885.

² During the period 1886-90, for which there are adequate records, there were never less than twenty Manchester Chamber Directors sitting on the Executive Committee of the League in any one year.

trader and important cotton manufacturer—was one of the more prominent bimetallists who also had the time to perambulate around the northern industrial towns urging “that there should be a common standard and measure of value among all the commercial nations of the World, so that our industry may rest on a safe and stable basis undisturbed by the fluctuations and dislocations which, under the present system of disunited currencies, are inevitable ”.¹

Inside the Manchester Chamber a coterie of members—all supporters of the Bi-Metallic League—grouped themselves around Sir William Houldsworth and purposely utilized every opportunity to impress their monetary opinions upon other members. Since the major proportion of British cotton goods were sold to silver-using Asiatic communities, the bimetallists were particularly concerned “that the ill effects of the currency system were restricting the Lancashire cotton industry from participating in the recent brisk business activity which other British industries are now enjoying ”. In their opinion “it was the low price of silver which gave the silver using textile producing countries an undue advantage in competition on the World market, and at the same time worked as a high tariff wall for the protection of their own home industry ”.²

One of the peculiarities of the bimetallist controversy, as indeed of the Manchester demands for the increased economic development of the Indian and Colonial Territories, was that the agitation increased in intensity during periods of depressed trade. In October 1892, for instance, when trading conditions in the Lancashire industry were worsening, a full scale debate lasting more than three days was organized by the Chamber after forty-eight member-firms had signed a requisition notice calling a Special Meeting of all interested Lancashire businessmen and

¹ Taken from Sir William Houldsworth’s speech at Blackburn on 25 October 1889. Blackburn businessmen remained firmly anti-bimetallist despite the fact that most of the cloth woven in Blackburn mills eventually found its way into the silver using Asiatic markets. For a recital of the Blackburn Chamber opinions on the bimetallist problem see *Economist Commercial Review, Monthly Trade Supplement*, July 1893.

² From a speech delivered by J. C. Fielden in the Manchester Chamber; P.M.C.C. 1 October 1888.

cotton union officials¹ to discuss and approve a Resolution seeking "to re-open the World's mints to the unrestricted coinage of both gold and silver". There were a great many speeches made during the three day discussions until Mr. Beith, a Manchester Chamber Director—moved the closure. In doing so he argued that the decision made in 1873, to maintain gold as the sole measure of international trading value, had resulted in violent fluctuations on the Eastern Exchanges and had placed a heavy strain upon gold supplies which in his opinion had helped to accentuate the precipitous decline in World commodity prices. "In contrast to the present situation", he went on, "the use of the gold and silver coinage together as one single measure of value for all countries of the World would remove those prevalent price depressions and their disastrous effects upon business might be ended." Despite the shaky monetary reasoning, the resolution was approved and forwarded to the Prime Minister, but, instead of "re-opening the World's mints to the unrestricted coinage of both gold and silver", the British Government decided in December 1893 to close the Indian mints, which at least for the time being dealt with the problem of fluctuating exchange rates so far as Lancashire's Indian and South East Asiatic export trade was concerned.

IV

The anxiety shared by most Lancashire cotton businessmen at the rapid growth of the Indian cotton industry—particularly its spinning section—and the loss of trade to Indian competitors in Asiatic markets, prompted the Manchester Chamber to form a Commission of Enquiry in October 1886² "for the purpose of

¹ All the cotton unions were pro-bimetallist and one of the reasons why the Unions supported the Conservative Party rather than the Liberals at this period was because they believed that only a Conservative Government would reform the currency and stabilize the exchanges with the East. (See Schulz-Gaevernitz, *Social Peace* (1894), p. 168.)

² P.M.C.C. 31 October 1886. During the inter-war years 1919-39 the growth of Japanese competition to Lancashire goods was followed by a suggestion to form a similar Commission for the purpose of examining the cost differentials of cotton textile production in Great Britain and Japan. (See B. Ellinger, "Lancashire Trade with China", *Manchester Statistical Society*, 1927.)

examining and reporting to a special meeting of the Chamber as to the causes and circumstances which have enabled Bombay spinners to supersede those of Lancashire". The form of the Enquiry was important; a calculation was to be made of the total costs involved in transporting and selling Indian and Lancashire cotton yarns in foreign markets. The costs of the previous year's working were to be taken as standard in both countries and the exchange rate was to be 17*d.* to the rupee. Circulars were distributed among Oldham and Bombay firms for information on raw material costs, yarn distribution costs, the cost of repairs, lighting, holding stores—in fact, the full details of the mill cost structure in the two countries. In addition, witnesses were invited to deliver oral evidence before the Enquiry Committee sitting in Manchester.

J. C. Fielden, who employed 2,000 workers in one of the biggest cotton spinning concerns in England, was one of those invited to give evidence.¹ He believed that "wage costs for a 30,000 spindle mill, spinning coarse yarns in Lancashire, with 120 hands would be about ·64*d.* per lb. of yarn. The total cost would depend upon the raw cotton used." In his opinion "120 workpeople in Oldham could do what 750 workers did in Bombay". Along with all the other Lancashire witnesses Fielden stressed the favourable location factors enjoyed by the Indian spinners—particularly their close proximity to raw cotton supplies; "for the Lancashire spinner", Fielden maintained, "there is the additional cost of transporting the cotton from Liverpool and putting it down in Oldham, whereas the Indian spinner merely takes the raw cotton from the *Bombay* market to the *Bombay* mill. There is then the extra cost of transporting *spun yarn* from Oldham to Bombay before it is even in a state to compete with Indian *spun yarns*. It costs at least 1.06*d.* per lb. of yarn in transport charges before the yarn is ready to be sold in Bombay; by comparison, at an outside estimate, the Indian spinners have paid $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* per lb. in transport charges."

¹ J. C. Fielden, besides being a private cotton spinner, was a director of two Oldham public spinning companies, and also promoted two cloth manufacturing companies—one at Ashton-on-Mersey and the other at Haslingden.

Fielden also supplied details of costings taken from a Middleton spinning firm, spinning up to 20's coarse yarns from the lowest grades of Indian cotton.

There was nothing in the first two clauses of the Final Report with which one might quarrel seriously ; additions could have been made to account for the loss of trade by the Lancashire merchants and manufacturers,¹ but only the essential facts and few private opinions had yet been quoted. The third clause in the Report was rather different. It contained the two opposing views within the Chamber, of the place accorded to monetary factors in accounting for the decline of Lancashire's trade with Asia.

George Lord and a majority of the Chamber directors maintained that the recent changes in the relative value of silver had had little or no direct effect upon Asiatic marketing conditions ; in their view, "the main items in the working of mills such as machinery, cotton and coals are unaffected by a fall in the gold value of the rupee, but wages and local taxation are not immediately affected and until an adjustment takes place, the Indian spinner is at an advantage. This advantage is so small by comparison with those included under Clauses I and II as to be almost negligible."

Elijah Helm, the Secretary of the Chamber, and a few other directors, opposed the majority view. For them the fall in silver values "gave the Lancashire spinner a reduced sterling price for his yarn—through the conversion of dollars into English money at a lower rate of exchange, whilst his competitor in Bombay escaped all loss from this source. The fixed capital costs in mill production do not suffer but the labour costs, taxation, insurance, etc., all count. The latter are the advantages which Bombay secures over Lancashire."

Chamber members were irrevocably divided on this issue and as a result, both sets of arguments appear side by side in the

¹ *The Economist* (30 July 1888), for instance, commented in their review of the Chamber's Report that : "the leading cause of the Chinese decline in handling English yarns is that Bombay spinnings resemble Chinese yarns. English mill-managers, having just returned from the East, claim that Indian yarn is rougher than the Oldham, Wigan, or Rochdale qualities. It is softer spun and the fibres of the yarn stand out : *the truth is that they produce the yarn to suit the requirements of the customer and Lancashire employers ought to do the same.*"

Final Report. Its eventual publication provoked a storm of protest from the Bombay millowners. A special Association meeting of the Bombay millowners was called to consider official counter measures "against the philanthropic endeavours of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce to hamper the staple industry of Bombay". Sir Dinshaw Manockjee Petit, Chairman of the Association, opened the proceedings and "gave it as his own experience that the factory hands of Bombay were, if not more healthy, at least quite as healthy as other individuals of their class who are not mill labourers". Mr. Cotton, another Bombay millowner, criticized Manchester's suggestion in the Chamber Report that the Indian cotton operatives should return to agricultural employment and grow cotton for Manchester. "It would also be pleasant", he commented, "to see Bombay as a depot for Eastern products and Western manufactures; no doubt it would, for Manchester—but what of Bombay? There is room in world markets for both Indian and Lancashire textile producers; we cannot compete with Lancashire on the finer counts, but she cannot come near us on the others."¹

The speeches continued and enthusiasm ran high, one Bombay millowner later remarking that "Manchester has resorted to the war of the knife". But nothing more dramatic than a strong protest against the sinister intentions of the Manchester Chamber was finally registered by the meeting.

V

Although a majority of the cotton businessmen were prepared to exhort foreign governments to maintain free trading fiscal policies, rarely, if at all before 1914, did they propose any form of physical retaliation against the goods from those countries where protective policies prevailed.

That is not to say that the activities of the Chamber remained unaffected by the growing demand for Tariff Reform in the rest of the United Kingdom during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. There was no more important centre of British industry desired by the Protectionists than the citadel of free

¹ *Economist Commercial Review, Monthly Trade Supplement*, January 1889.

trade in Manchester. With this end in view a branch of the National Fair Trade League had been founded in Manchester during 1886 by two local businessmen, Hibbert and Rigg. The former was a member of the Manchester Chamber as well as being Mayor of Chorley, whilst Rigg was a partner in Rigg Brothers—at that time a small cotton spinning and manufacturing firm in Bury, Lancashire.¹ The fair trade assault on the Chamber developed quickly, with Hibbert playing a leading hand. In May 1886² a Resolution expressing "the unswerving confidence of the Manchester Chamber in the principles of free trade" and condemning "the movement in favour of a policy of retaliation against Protectionist countries" was carried by a majority of only two votes with six abstentions. At the following Quarterly meeting,³ the motion "that having waited in vain more than forty years for other nations to follow England's free trade example, this Chamber thinks the time has now arrived to reconsider its position" was lost by only two votes. Even admitting that the whole body of the Chamber membership was not present at this or the previous meeting, it cannot be denied that the fair trade challenge had by this stage begun to assume important proportions.

The fair traders' assault continued during the following year with proposals to impose "moderate tariffs for revenue purposes on all manufactured articles from countries competing with our own industries, with a corresponding reduction of the burdens which bear so heavily upon the mercantile community at home"; and "the abolition of all duties upon tea, coffee, cocoa, chicory, and dried fruits, and the imposition of revenue duties of an equal value upon wheat, barley, oats, rye, beans, etc., from protected countries".

Both proposals were heavily defeated and the Chamber went on to "re-affirm its unabated confidence in the principles of free trade". But the Manchester free traders were not satisfied merely to re-affirm their free trading principles, they went on to

¹ Rigg's then controlled 100 looms and 10,000 spindles; a very small cotton business judged even by nineteenth century standards.

² P.M.C.C. 3 May 1886.

³ P.M.C.C. 1 November 1886.

suggest alternative means of overcoming the increased competitive conditions for the sale of their goods in the World markets. They returned to the mid-century Cobdenite formula of expanding the quantity level of final market demand by suggesting the increased development of the World's economically backward lands.¹ It meant "urging upon her Majesty's Government to foster by every possible means the systematic creation of new markets by enabling such part of our annual surplus population of over 350,000 souls, for whom our industries fail to find employment, to be drafted into Canada, Australia and South Africa on rational self supporting principles, thereby doubling the present purchasing power of these Colonies every five to ten years and drawing them into closer union with the Mother Country".²

The need for increased population and development of the Colonial Territories impressed many other cotton trade organizations³ beside the Manchester Chamber as one possible means of remedying the depressed condition of the cotton trade in the late nineteenth century.

The Chamber Protectionists found themselves momentarily in the majority of those present at a Quarterly Meeting held in December 1888, and they secured the passage of a Resolution which suggested "that goods imported into the United Kingdom should pay an equal and proportionate share of taxation, which they would have paid, had the goods been produced or

¹ See, too, the Manchester Chamber Memorial to Lord Salisbury (then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), October 1879: "At the present time when the industries of this district and indeed the whole country are suffering from an unparalleled depression; we consider that the attention of the Government should be specially directed toward the development of our trade with foreign countries; we would urge upon your Lordship's attention the extreme desirability of extending by means of treaties or otherwise the commercial relations of this Country with other Foreign nations and our Colonies to the end not only of promoting our common trading interests, but also as the best means of securing the blessings of peace and general security" (P.M.C.C. 8 October 1879).

² P.M.C.C. 30 January 1888.

³ A Resolution framed by the Blackburn Weavers' Association (18 December 1884) and printed in the Northern Press, proved typical of many such Resolutions accepted by Lancashire Trade Associations at this period—"That the question of opening up new markets for cotton cloths be pushed on as speedily as possible for the purpose of obtaining an increase in trade".

manufactured in the United Kingdom".¹ Immediately the resolution voting figures were announced, those free traders who were present rose and walked out of the Chamber.

The news of this sudden weakening in Manchester's support for free trade produced a sensational reaction from the rest of the country, but William Fogg—one of the Chamber directors—disclosed the true facts of the situation in a letter to *The Times* on the following day.² According to this account, only eighty members of the total Chamber membership of 1,000 were present at the meeting, whilst he named in his letter the activities of a paid Fair Trade League lecturer who had been sponsoring this continual agitation in the Manchester Chamber.

Only a fortnight after the resolution supporting a return to protection had been accepted by the Chamber, the directors circularized all members with a specially arranged postal proxy vote. In the replies nearly eight hundred of the most influential and most successful Lancashire cotton businessmen declared their "unfaltering adherence to the principles of free trade, so often affirmed by this Chamber", and resolved further, "that the Protectionist Resolution did not represent the views of the Chamber as a whole". Even though the resolution was carried by a large majority, 221 Chamber members voted against it—which was certainly a significant pointer to the growth in strength of the protectionist cause in Lancashire.

After this sharp reverse for the protectionists, and with the betterment of trading conditions for the cotton industry during 1889 and 1890, the free trade-protectionist battle in the Chamber abated temporarily and permitted other subjects to steal the attentions of the Chamber directors. But at the Quarterly General Meeting in April 1891³ the struggle was resumed again when the protectionists proposed that: "this Chamber is of the opinion that the time has arrived for imposing import duties

¹ P.M.C.C. 24 December 1888.

² *The Times*, 26 December 1888.

³ P.M.C.C. 27 April 1891. It was only possible for the protectionists to include these resolutions, urging the overthrow of free trade, on the agenda for discussion at the Quarterly or Annual Meetings of the Chamber, for none of their members was a Chamber director, and, therefore, they could not propose a special meeting of the Chamber to discuss the question.

upon all competing labour products coupled with commercial union with our Colonies and Possessions, by means of preferential import duties and so enlarging the circle of exchange and securing approximate free trade within the limits of the British Empire." On this occasion there were only thirteen members willing to support the resolution, with four times their number in opposition.

The Chamber Quarterly Meeting in July the following year produced yet another protectionist resolution¹; it pointed out "that our fiscal policy of admitting at our ports free from taxation, competing food products and manufactured goods from countries where they cost the least in wages, is injurious to our wage earners and the industrial interests of Great Britain and Ireland". Once more the motion was lost, again by a heavy majority.

So far as the nineteenth century is concerned this proved the last of the protectionist resolutions debated by the Manchester Chamber, but there were to be many more in later years.

VI

It would be only correct to conclude from these incidents that at the end of the nineteenth century the majority of the Lancashire cotton business community still remained firm in its support of a free trade fiscal policy. The numerous resolutions which appeared before the Manchester Chamber of Commerce urging an immediate return to fiscal protection would be more correctly interpreted as the product of a deliberate and skilful campaign organized by the supporters of the National Fair Trade League within the Manchester Chamber, rather than as a spontaneous true revolt of Lancashire business against the principles of free trade. In fact, free trade had been the vogue for so long and whilst the prices of Lancashire cottons remained competitive in international markets the majority of Lancashire producers neither desired nor proved capable of shaking themselves free from thinking in the old terms.

¹ P.M.C.C. 25 July 1892.

RALPH SNEYD: TORY COUNTRY GENTLEMAN¹

By DAVID SPRING, PH.D.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
BALTIMORE

I

RALPH SNEYD (1793–1870) came of an “old respected family” that had long been in possession of the family mansion of Keele Hall in Staffordshire, and had long stood in the forefront of county society.² His father, Walter Sneyd, as member of parliament and Lieutenant-Colonel of the Staffs. Militia, kept the family honours bright, but the son brought little lustre to them. He failed of election to parliament and he bungled the local Conservative organization; his sole public office was that of High Sheriff of the county in 1844. In 1829 he succeeded to large family estates where—so far as the world might judge—he lived and died “an obtuse, quiet, respectable country gentleman” to be remembered by his descendants only “as forming a link in the chain of a long pedigree”.³

Although Sneyd moved much in country-house society, in the company of persons whose letters and journals have been published, they tell us little about him. Charles Greville merely noted his presence at fashionable gatherings in the great houses. Sydney Smith remarked that he spent a day with Sneyd at St. Cloud;⁴ and although Sneyd hit off the Whig parson most accurately “as something between Cato and Punch”,⁵ Smith had nothing to say about his companion.

¹ The correspondence of Ralph Sneyd used for this article forms part of the Raymond Richards collection of Sneyd Muniments deposited in the John Rylands Library and made available by him to scholars.

² R. W. Jeffery (ed.), *Dyott's Diary 1781–1845* (London, 1907), *passim*.

³ Sneyd MSS., Agar Ellis to R. Sneyd, 13 November 1826. Agar Ellis warned Sneyd in this letter that, talented as he was, he was destined to obscurity; and Agar Ellis reproached him for his indolence.

⁴ Nowell C. Smith, *The Letters of Sydney Smith*, i (Oxford, 1953), 442, Sydney Smith to his wife, 29 April 1826.

⁵ Hon. F. Leveson Gower (ed.), *Letters of Harriet Countess Granville*, (London, 1894), 384, Lady Granville to Lady Carlisle, May 1826.

Miss Edgeworth met him at Trentham and found "young Mr. Sneyd of Kiel (*sic*)—very fashionable".¹ Trentham, the Italian palace of the Leveson Gowers, was not far from Keele, and Sneyd made it a second home. One of its family, Lady Harriet Granville, knew him well, and her letters disclose more about Sneyd than do other published sources.

One side of Sneyd they make plain enough—that of the raconteur who was both wit and mime, and a constant delight to his audience. That there was another side to the man is merely hinted at: "Mr Sneyd," Lady Harriet wrote in 1825, "has a mind that reaches all subjects and understands all thoughts."² More of Sneyd *au sérieux* Lady Harriet never revealed. Fortunately, some little while ago, a large number of Sneyd's own letters came to hand, and are now housed in the John Rylands Library. The correspondence of few Englishmen in the nineteenth century—and who did not write letters endlessly in that patient age?—provide such enjoyable reading. What is more they cast light on that side of Sneyd that Lady Harriet merely indicated. Some mysteries remain, but the new letters warrant this sketch of Ralph Sneyd.

What is to be learned from scanning the uneventful life of so obscure a country gentleman? Nothing of momentous consequence, to be sure. But Sneyd was no mediocrity: there was richness and vigour in his thought, and knowing him may help one to remember—what is in danger of being forgotten—that aristocracy bred individuality, that the ranks of England's landed gentlemen held all manner of persons, and that there are many pitfalls for historians who lean heavily on the general attributes of social classes. Also Sneyd was a Tory. And it may be instructive to savour his brand of Toryism, and to appreciate how little it deserves Bagehot's jibe at country gentlemen: those "grand files of speechless men (who) have always represented the land of England".³

¹ F. V. Barry (ed.), *Maria Edgeworth; Chosen Letters* (Boston and New York, 1931), p. 205, Miss Edgeworth to Mrs. Ruxton, 20 January 1819.

² Leveson Gower, *Letters of Countess Granville*, i. 366, Lady Granville to Lady Carlisle, November 1825.

³ Mrs. Russell Barington (ed.), *The Works and Life of Walter Bagehot*, iv (London, 1915), 142.

II

In 1827, after an unsuccessful contest for a seat in parliament, Sneyd declared himself thoroughly indifferent to the course of England's politics. Neither the removal of Lord Liverpool—whose worth he appreciated as few people did—nor the choice of a new Prime Minister revived his interest.¹ But Liverpool's death began an era of catastrophe for the Tory party. From 1827 to 1830 it fell to pieces. Canning's death—"the extinction of that great light"² as Sneyd put it—followed close on Liverpool's; Huskisson, whom Sneyd also esteemed highly met his tragic end;³ and finally Wellington and his ministers resigned. This series of misfortunes proved sufficient to stir Sneyd out of his apathy. He was now of a mind that none but a government led by the Duke could keep the gates closed against the flood of revolution.⁴

The prolonged crisis of the Reform Bill filled Sneyd with horror, for his Tory philosophy convinced him that he faced the beginning of the end, the first stages of an inevitable dissolution of society. It had never before occurred to him to fear for his property; but now he looked upon his lands at Keele and wondered how much longer he would be permitted to enjoy them. "Here we are in daily expectation", he wrote in May 1831, "of all the Colliers and all the Potters, who are governed by the 'Central Union' at Manchester turning out—and if they do—we are entirely at their mercy."⁵ There entered his mind even the terrible thought of going into exile abroad, where property and person would be safe.⁶ And although he suppressed this idea, he still felt it wise to stop work on a variety of projects "founded upon the notion that I should pass the latter part of my life upon my property, and in the enjoyment of the means which my forefathers possess'd".⁷

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 27 February 1827.

² Ibid. R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 23 December 1828 (?).

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Agar Ellis, 23 September 1830.

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 30 November 1830.

⁵ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Agar Ellis, 17 May 1831.

⁶ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Agar Ellis, 5 May 1831.

⁷ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, October 1832 ('33?). In this quotation as elsewhere I have translated some of Sneyd's shorthand; e.g. "sh^d" into "should".

It happened, however, that no *jacquerie* expelled him from his estates before or after the passing of the Reform Bill, and Sneyd soon resorted again to his private and engrossing pleasure of landscaping Keele. This may have helped to ease the pangs of political defeat, although the great world of public policy still seemed shrouded in darkness and "the worst [still] seemed an inevitable certainty".¹ Then, at the end of 1834, with King William's dismissal of his Whig ministers, even the face of politics changed for the better. Sneyd now began to hope that, if the old constitution could not be restored, at least something of its spirit could be kept alive. The new order of things was not pleasant, but it might be "yet possible to make it fit for a gentleman to live under".² In spite of his indolent and fastidious nature, he was enough moved to take up the arduous and grubby business of local party politics. Lady Harriet Granville reported that "Mr. Sneyd is busy organizing Conservative measures in Staffordshire";³ and General Dyott, an old friend of his father, noted approvingly in his journal that young Sneyd had come forward as President of the new Conservative Association in the county,⁴ and was busying himself calling upon the local nobility "to make a show of the power we possess".⁵

Such zeal, however, lasted little more than a year. In 1837 General Dyott made the melancholy entry in his diary that the Association's finances were thoroughly muddled and its electoral machinery out of joint—"owing to want of energy and attention in President Sneyd than to any other cause".⁶ Sneyd had once more concluded that the game of politics was not worth the candle, and that creating an "effect in a landscape" was as worthy an occupation as winning an election. "I do not feel that my baubles are emptier, my toys more childish."⁷

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 26 March 1835.

² Ibid.

³ Leveson Gower, *Letters of Countess Granville*, ii. 186, Lady Granville to the Duke of Devonshire, 13 April 1835.

⁴ Jeffery, *Dyott's Diary*, ii. 196.

⁵ Ibid. ii. 238.

⁶ Ibid. ii. 255.

⁷ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 5 July 1839.

He never saw fit to change his mind again. Comically enough, in 1844, he became for the year that curious personage High Sheriff of the county, a dubious honour that he presumably could not escape. The account of his distress is best left to Sneyd's eloquent pen.

Where, in the black catalogue of human ills, Philosophers place the office of Sheriff, I am not exactly cognizant—probably in the same class with Bankruptcy and Mental distraction, to which it appears pretty directly to lead. . . . How should you like to live at a lodging in the dirty town of Stafford for a week in March—and a week in July—and a week in Midwinter—and to give foul feeds at an Inn to Justices & Grand Jurors—and to do 500 things w^h will equally disgust me. . . . In this absurd country where no abuse is ever reformed, it will cost me about £1200. . . . Now I'll trouble you, Mr. Queen's Remembrancer [his friend, Vincent], or any other authority of the Court of Exchequer to tell me on what class of her subjects your gracious Mistress has the power to inflict (against their will and without consent of Parliament) so heavy a Mulct. Talk of Ship Money indeed! Why was there no shrieval Hampden to blow his trumpet and hurl his javelins agst such Tyranny? Then I must always be *within reach* in case of an Election (which thank God is not likely), or a requisition for a County Meeting, which any fools are competent to sign.¹

III

And so after a brief excursion into county politics and a short period of hopefulness about the state of the nation, Sneyd withdrew forever from public life. Earlier in the twenties, in a more cheerful time, he had declared himself but a spectator ; and plainly his character was such as to induce him to seek retirement under any circumstances. With all his chaff and wit, he was also melancholy ; perhaps a failure in love had helped make him so. And the hurly burly of a public career—what Jane Austen once called “the efforts of civility and the noise of numbers”²—clearly bored and fatigued him ; he sometimes found it too much to dine with his tenants at Keele.³ But in addition to these things, Sneyd's withdrawal expressed the distaste of a man who found the age in which he lived repulsive to his tastes and principles.

Early Victorian England was the home of earnest and practical men : solicitors, engineers, merchants, manufacturers, administrators, economists and reformers. Evangelical piety often

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 26 February 1844. ² *Emma*, ch. 35.

³ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 22 October 1859.

went hand in hand with practical intelligence, and a sense of being ever in the eye of the Lord often prompted a mastery of things, the better to serve the Master of all men. This cast of mind is usually and rightly associated with names like Wilberforce and Thornton, Stephen and Macaulay, with the counting house and the professions. But it was also communicated to that other England, of meadow and stream, of parsonage and country house, where by 1840 it had gained an ascendancy—although in not quite the same form taken elsewhere. Still there was much in common : a fundamental seriousness that nurtured responsibility and self-discipline, and a zest for the labours of the intellect as well as for those of private and public affairs.¹

It perhaps needs to be said that not every landed gentleman exhibited these traits in the forties and fifties ; for social classes behave with less uniformity than some students of society would care to admit. The Corinthian world of the Regency and George IV was never completely extinguished even in the middle decades of the century. Lord Huntingtower, the seventh Earl of Cardigan, young Mr. Windham of Felbrigg—to pick some names at random—all flourished in these years. But in more ways than one they belonged to a kind of aristocratic underworld : raffish and Hogarthian enough, yet less inclined than ever to expose itself to the bright light of day. After all, William Crockford, the notorious gambling-house keeper, retired from business in 1840. And almost simultaneously the Queen and her beloved Albert established a new order in the life of the Court. Fresh winds were blowing in upper-class society, and they blew most powerfully in the decades of the forties and fifties.

Singular transformations thus often occurred in the leadership of landed families, as sons proved themselves very different from their fathers. Consider, for example, Lord Chandos who salvaged a remnant of the family estates from the ruin that his father, the Duke of Buckingham, had brought upon them. He was scarcely more than a youth, but he had learned vital religion at his mother's knee, and it served him well. Few noblemen in the nineteenth century had to face so distressing and humiliating

¹ See G. M. Young, *Early Victorian England*, ii (London, 1936), 413–17.

a predicament. Surrounded though he was by clamorous creditors and clever solicitors, plunged in a morass of legal and financial complexity, he persevered, saving what could be saved and winning himself a reputation for good sense and businesslike capacities. Admittedly this was not the precise pattern of affairs throughout the landed society in these years. Not every father was a Duke of Buckingham, and not every son a Chandos. But there was much that was representative in the story of this family, especially where it touches upon the life of the younger man, who was serious, responsible and informed, a man of prayer and a man of business.¹

Sneyd, however, was not an evangelical, although he was in his own way a Christian and an Anglican. One gathers that religion for him was pretty straightforward, a matter of decency and good sense. He loathed Regency rakes like Alvanley and Sefton, and himself avoided dragging the family name in the mire.² It was his duty to attend church, in order that the villagers be afforded a good example.³ It was also his duty to provide for the fittings and fabric of the parish church, although it was not his duty to admire unreservedly the beauties of Victorian stained glass.⁴ There was not a trace in Sneyd of that deep conviction of human depravity, and its consequence, that relentless moral self-examination of the evangelical mind.⁵ Nor was beauty for him touched by evil. In short, Sneyd's Christianity was latitudinarian, and tending to scepticism; it bore the flavour of the Augustan age.

Declining to cultivate enthusiasm in religion, Sneyd tended to avoid it elsewhere—at least wherever his contemporaries were given to it. He rebelled instinctively against the sort of earnestness that made much of the notion of improvement, secretly sure that man's existence was precarious and his real betterment

¹ Stowe MSS., in the possession of the Huntington Library, California, *passim*.

² Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 31 October 1832.

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, undated, probably in 1820s; Sneyd writes: "I must now go to Evening Church—as I shirked in the morning—or the village will think its Seigneur a heathen."

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Rev. Walter Sneyd, 2 May 1870.

⁵ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 8 January 1863.

unlikely. This was a way of looking at society and the universe that was suited to the aristocratic and still rural world of the eighteenth century, not to the age of coal and iron and bustling reform. And indeed Sneyd would have been far more comfortable with Burke and Gibbon than he was with John Stuart Mill and Thomas Babington Macaulay. What he valued most in the world—and about which he could be serious—was Augustan urbanity and all that it meant in the way of wit, elegance and beauty. On reading the correspondence of Madame du Deffand, Sneyd remarked that "I feel to know all that society as if I had lived in it";¹ and on the death of Lord Holland in 1840 he genuinely mourned the passing of the old aristocracy: "I do not believe that there ever existed a *Machinery* so perfect for the Extraction of the largest amount and highest quality of social enjoyment."² With Holland House gone there was not much left but the supreme dullness of Victoria's court. When his Staffordshire neighbour, Lord Granville, was to stay with the queen at Coburg for a month, Sneyd gasped: "Think of the 30 evenings!!! Obscurity has its compensations."³

Sneyd's reading showed the style of the man. He once told Henry Vincent that in his youth he had had a keen appetite for metaphysics, that he had spent many an hour with the works of Dugald Stewart and Bishop Berkeley.⁴ This taste passed away, but his favourite authors, one suspects, belonged to the eighteenth century, or at any rate, shared the Augustan outlook and style. He took small pleasure in Macaulay who was neither a gentleman nor a judicious historian.⁵ He found German thinkers sheer "mystification", and Carlyle equally unintelligible. Was there, he asked, any English translation of Carlyle?⁶ In short, Sneyd preferred the hard lucid prose of the eighteenth century; he disliked "rhapsodising"; and he refused to bow down to the idols of materialism which Macaulay and so many of his contemporaries worshipped.

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 7 December 1859.

² Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 9 November 1840.

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 6 August 1863.

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 16 February 1863.

⁵ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 1 September 1857.

⁶ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 27 November 1850.

Sneyd, one may be sure, failed to find the same pleasure that many landed gentlemen found in reading the solemn, utilitarian articles of the *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society*. For Sneyd nature was not a kind of machine capable of an ever growing efficiency and productivity, if only its secrets were searched for and rightly read. It was not in him to feel that curiosity about the natural world that was so widespread among Englishmen of the early nineteenth century and that often took the shape in those innocent times of an insatiable appetite for measuring things—almost anything, it would seem, so long as it was measurable. Lord Althorp of the Reform Bill liked nothing better than calculating to four decimal places the degrees of particular cross breedings among his beloved cows.¹ And Earl Fitzwilliam was wont in the spring to measure daily the growth of flowering buds. Or, what is perhaps a greater oddity to our eyes, he insisted on putting friends and dependents on the scales, recording their height and weight, as if this information would somehow prove valuable in the future and reveal some attribute of nature of which men had been unaware.²

Landlords like Fitzwilliam and Philip Pusey, Althorp and Sir James Graham, were enthusiasts for the gospel of high farming. In the 1820's Althorp had gone to the length of setting up a laboratory in his rooms in the Albany to acquaint himself with the new science of agricultural chemistry.³ Sneyd, one suspects, knew next to nothing about the science of farming, and at bottom agreed with the poet, Coleridge, that agriculture ought not to be looked on merely as a kind of industry.⁴ His mind was engaged, not by schemes for draining and by plans for cattle yards,⁵ which matters he left entirely to his agent, but by the natural beauty of the countryside and by the art of adding to that beauty through human contrivance, skill, and taste. He was as pleased to find, as he eventually did, that good farming

¹ Althorp MSS., in the possession of Earl Spencer, Althorp Park, Northamptonshire.

² Milton MSS., in the possession of the Northamptonshire Record Society.

³ Althorp MSS.

⁴ Professor Shedd (ed.), *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, vi (New York, 1860), 215.

⁵ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 12 August 1844.

had improved his landscape as that it had lengthened his rent roll.¹

It happened therefore that Sneyd was not long in possession of the family estates before he began his "chief amusement", the working out of his picture of Keele—the creation of a "place" and a "house".² He started with the place: in 1830 he was planting cedars of Lebanon, "marching and countermarching detachments of hollies—platooning yews—& like Caesar covering my bald places with laurel".³ In the following year he was excavating: "sinking one pool to the level of another . . . the twelve labours of Hercules were mere child's play".⁴ And in 1832 he was staking out an orchard; "besides their blossom and their beauty, there is an association of English rural home and comfort about an orchard (to say nothing of the *word*) which gives me infinite pleasure and satisfaction."⁵ Charles Grenville protested that if all reports were true Sneyd "must have planted over the whole county of Stafford". Sneyd replied that he was working to a plan; having begun with the grounds he was now approaching the "outworks"—lodges, stables and farm buildings—and eventually he would reach the "citadel", the house.⁶

He was to be a long time in reaching the house. Well before he got there, however, he had acquired a nicer discrimination in architecture than many of his contemporaries, who were as perfunctory in their architectural taste as Mr. Rushworth in *Mansfield Park*.⁷ The age of Victoria was not a time of distinguished country-house building: Thoresby, Mentmore, Belvoir and Peckforton are not names fondly recalled by Englishmen when they review their heritage of domestic architecture. Instead it was a time when country gentlemen had their minds filled with the stables, cottages, and homesteads that would serve the needs of an efficient agriculture. If they thought about the style of their houses, they were often inclined not to make enough distinction

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 10 October 1860.

² Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 11 January 1855.

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Agar Ellis, 18 April 1830.

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 16 August 1831.

⁵ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 10 March 1832.

⁶ Ibid. R. Sneyd to Agar Ellis, 8 March 1832.

⁷ Jane Austen, *Mansfield Park*, ch. 6.

between what was comfortable and massive, and what was beautiful, as when some judged Woburn, the seat of the Duke of Bedford, an example of architectural beauty.¹

Sneyd was not taken in by Woburn's grandeur. Neither art nor nature had made it, but merely size and lavish furnishings. It was no accident that a duke without taste and a duchess with bad taste were its owners.² But in Sneyd's opinion, there were far worse houses : Eaton in Cheshire belonging to the Marquess of Westminster and Alton Towers in Shropshire belonging to the Earl of Shrewsbury being perhaps the most offensive ; "monsters which tasteless wealth spawns on the face of the land".³ The Earl's was an "unintelligible house, bedizened in a masquerade dress of antiquity indicating total want of eye and feeling and an equal ignorance of the immense resources of Castle Gothic".⁴ Eaton "was a private residence in the disguise of a Cathedral", thus defying "sense, taste and convenience".⁵ The Marquess who inherited Eaton some decades after its building asked Sneyd what could be done to remove its deformities. He was told either to leave it alone or demolish it ; half measures would not answer.⁶

It was not sufficient, however, for a house to satisfy the canons of "sense, taste and convenience". Kedleston, for example, was correct and intelligible enough, "a sort of black-stone syllogism. . . which one cannot reason down because it is all demonstrably right". But it bored Sneyd : "one can only yawn and cross one self".⁷ Obviously he looked for something more than correct proportions ; and at houses like Hardwick and Wrest he found it. Hardwick he always visited from Chatsworth as a guest of the Duke of Devonshire, and on returning invariably discovered that Chatsworth with all its splendour seemed "comparatively mean".⁸ And Wrest, among those great houses which he knew, he found to be "facile princeps". Admittedly its style was bizarre but this was redeemed "by a

¹ T. Martin, *The Life of His Royal Highness, The Prince Consort*, i (New York, 1875), 102.

² Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 6 November 1856.

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 18 October 1842.

⁵ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, November 1862.

⁷ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 15 November 1853.

⁴ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

certain grandiosity. . . by noble associations—being the architectural type of the aristocracy of France in its brilliant and luxurious days".¹ Bess of Hardwick's great Derbyshire mansion doubtless fired his imagination in the same fashion, by calling up an heroic age in England's history when aristocracy and beauty had it all their own way.

Wrest and Hardwick, the Canalettes of Woburn, the place and house at Keele—to such things Sneyd gave the fire of his energies and the close attention of his mind. Here he was confident, excited and enthused. But the humdrum business of estate management made a very different world in which he was indolent and childlike. Yet his estate was large and its concerns exceedingly complex. Keele was 9,000 acres in size, lying cheek by jowl with the Potteries. Below the soil there was an abundance of coal and ironstone; on it stood blast furnaces as well as the more conventional enterprise of a farming community. As railways and towns pressed upon Keele, the uses to which its land could be put became even more diverse; and the demands put upon the businesslike capacities of its owner became accordingly more severe.

In the main Sneyd's generation of landed gentlemen met the challenge of the industrial age. In doing so, not all made themselves familiar with new agricultural techniques or acquired the expert knowledge of the mechanic, as did Lord Chandos. But a large number learned the simple lessons of prudence and economy. To have a reasonably accurate notion of how one got one's money and how one spent it, to pay bills regularly, to examine accounts, and to hire responsible and proficient agents, these became almost universally heeded axioms of English estate management in the nineteenth century. Landlords who ignored such fundamental principles became markedly fewer as the century wore on. Ralph Sneyd, however, did his best to remain as long as possible in their select company.

He inevitably cut a curious and amusing figure. There is a glimpse to be caught of him in the company of his fellow ironmaster, Lord Granville, solemnly discussing the price of pig iron, mourning over the losses incurred when landed gentlemen

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 6 November 1856.

made it, and puzzling about the mysteries of the iron trade.¹ One can be sure that he avoided getting to the bottom of it all. He preferred to leave his business affairs wholly to an agent's discretion, rarely pressing him for information, relying implicitly on his honesty.² For some years it seemed as if no great harm was done, although there was a rapid accumulation of debt on the estate such as Sneyd's father had not known. But on the death of the chief agent in 1848, Sneyd's eyes were rudely opened to the frauds and depredations of his servant. Thereafter, for at least a year, "the Augean stable of his affairs" demanded the whole of his attention.³ He groaned aloud to his friend Vincent at the hateful necessity of spending his mornings in the company of solicitors. But what probably pained him more was the unavoidable suspension of "his occupation of making a place" at Keele.⁴

IV

Having gone this far in exploring Sneyd's mind and character, the shape of his ideas about society and politics is already visible. He was a Tory, but being averse to most Victorian things his Toryism is not to be confused with the Conservatism of Sir Robert Peel, still less with that of the *Saturday Review*. Sneyd stood much closer to Burke than to the great Prime Minister or to Fitzjames Stephen. Being deeply rooted in the simplicities of rural life and the sentimental associations of a traditional and hierarchical community, his view of the state and society had much of instinct in it. Not that he eschewed the intellect; but he found some of its uses suspect.

Like the older Tory Sneyd preferred that society in which men behaved traditionally, content to defer to lords and kings, untroubled by visions of material and social self-betterment. For Sneyd, as for Burke, the good society was not given to restless self-examination; the less it said about itself the better. Yet the time came when silence was broken, when the enemy at

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to Agar Ellis, 7 December 1829.

² Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, undated, probably 1848.

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 21 January 1849; 22 February 1848.

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 4 November 1848.

the gate proclaimed a strange and repulsive creed, and Tories like Burke or Sneyd reluctantly took to explaining themselves and their view of the world. Such an exercise was distasteful ; and to have recourse to it was in itself an alarming sign, indicating that the age of chivalry had given way to the age of sophisters and economists, and high principle had been swept aside by cool calculation. Yet, in self-defence, there was nothing for it but to join the discussion of fundamentals in society and politics.

So Sneyd resolved during the crisis over the first Reform Bill. What appalled him most in the argument of the reformers was the bland statement that the ultimate sanction of politics lay in the will of the people. For him as for Burke, "government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment, . . . not inclination";¹ and the plain truth of it was that the people were wanting in "reason and judgment". Sneyd was a compassionate landlord who took pains to make comfortable the life of his estate labourers. But this was a far different thing from giving them a voice in the nation's government, and striving to make them over into constant and intelligent readers of the *Edinburgh Review*.² A growing newspaper press asserting the sovereignty of public opinion ; and Whig ministers genuflecting before the popular will ; how remote this all was in Sneyd's opinion from the sanity of normal times when parliaments consulted the interests of the people, not their wishes.³

No one was surer than Sneyd that parliament's work had been well done. To his mind the chief function of government was to keep society together in peace and to maintain the traditional liberties of Englishmen. That such liberties could be enlarged by extending the franchise was far from apparent to him ; for he found no necessary connection between democracy and liberty.⁴ As Sneyd saw it, if the Reform Bill passed, not liberty would

¹ Edmund Burke, *Speech to the Electors of Bristol*.

² The Tory Wilberforce feared in the 1820s that the *Edinburgh* would become reading matter for agricultural labourers ; see R. I. Wilberforce and S. Wilberforce *The Life of William Wilberforce*, v (London, 1839), 47.

³ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 25 April 1831 ; R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 5 May 1831 (?).

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 12 May 1831 ; R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 30 November 1830.

triumph but equality. Political life would be reduced to the dead level of counting heads; the well worn Constitution of King, Lords and Commons would fall to pieces; and, perhaps most sinister of all, the new age of equality would demand that each man's wealth be not too unlike his neighbour's. The more popular the politics of a nation, Sneyd hinted, the more pre-occupied it would be with material things.¹

Such was Sneyd's prophecy—indeed the Tory prophecy—in 1831–2; and Sneyd lived long enough to have the mournful pleasure of knowing that Tories had been better prophets than Whigs. By the fifties he saw the advent of much that he had feared. With the revival of the question of the franchise, England was making ready to “descend another rung in the ladder of which the foot is in the Slough of American Democracy”;² and party politicians like Lord John Russell—“our little bilious Constitution-monger”,³ as Sneyd called him—were showing the way.⁴ By preserving something of the old variety in the franchise, the Reform Bill of 1832 had at least taken its stand on the principle of a representation of interests rather than on that of a delegation of men.⁵ But now this valuable principle was being challenged by reformers who sought to introduce a uniform franchise in the counties. “The infinite varieties of franchise opposed a formidable difficulty to ‘Reform bills’, but an universal £10 is changed into £5 by a scratch of the pen—nothing so simple.”⁶ The road was thereby opened “to further popular aggression”.

In addition the tripartite Constitution of Crown, Lords, and Commons *had* been dangerously undermined. The Commons had grown more powerful at the expense of both the Lords and the Crown. The ennobling of a mere historian like Macaulay pointed to the falling away of the Lords. “*Property, family & great public services* are the fundamental elements of the H. of

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to Lady Bute, 6 June 1831.

² Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, March 1857.

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 14 March 1854.

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 10 April 1859.

⁵ Coleridge refers to this distinction in his *Table Talk*; see *Complete Works of S. T. Coleridge*, vi, 352.

⁶ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 13 March (?) 1859.

L.'s",¹ Sneyd argued; but Macaulay had been elevated to it for his literary work,² thus tending to convert the House of Lords into Louis Philippe's Chamber of Peers—"into which all the Litterateurs & Journalists of the day were pitchforked"³—and rendering it less able than formerly to act as a separate and autonomous estate of the realm, as a check on the lower house.

The powers of the Crown had been similarly diminished. As early as 1840 Sneyd declared that the recent political revolution "has subjected Royalty to . . . hard conditions—[and] by these it must abide".⁴ Sneyd's Toryism had prompted him to revere even George IV, his faults and weaknesses notwithstanding; and he was still in 1840 anxious that the queen be "respected and upheld", and that she be not opposed by Conservatives "upon the principle of a Whig opposition".⁵ At the same time the young queen must not be misled as to her true position. Momentarily the balance of parties in parliament created an illusion of royal power, and Victoria must not be "flattered into the notion that she may play Queen Elizabeth; she will be laughed at & put down".⁶ The constitution of George III was dead, "cut down from a *tempered*—but a *real* Monarchy—to a Republic—which is only not an unmitigated democracy from the still preponderant influence of our *traditions* upon the National Mind".⁷

Finally, democracy was making ready to attack distinctions of rank and property, finding these most conspicuously situated in the aristocratic society of the land. "The Landowner", Sneyd wrote in 1859, "is universally treated by Reformers, either openly or by inference, as a public enemy—a standing abuse—a remnant of feudal oppression whose political existence is an insult and a wrong to 'the People' and should be trampled out, cashiered and swamped."⁸ If each kind of wealth was to have a share in government, as Sneyd maintained, then the political influence of the nobility and gentry was legitimate.

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 1 September 1857.

² Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 11 January 1860.

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 1 September 1857.

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 30 March 1840.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 13 March (?) 1859.

For land was wealth, in England a great source of wealth. Nor ought its owners to be abused, Sneyd added bitterly, merely because they formed a class "whose superior education & refinement & traditional influence provoke the envy of the Masses".¹

But, as Sneyd was strongly persuaded, the abortive reform bills of the fifties sought to nullify the power of the landed interest in the government of the country; and Mr. Locke King's £10 franchise for the counties was intended simply to transfer the county representation from the landowner to the small tradesman.² Furthermore what Locke King did in politics Mr. Gladstone did in finance. As a maker of budgets Gladstone belonged to the Manchester school of finance: "His fixed idea is the absolute substitution of Direct for indirect taxation";³ and his use of the income tax which pressed less severely on merchant and manufacturer would prove, Sneyd was sure, an effective engine of war for democracy. Sneyd admitted to Gladstone's gifts.⁴ But early in the day he hit on him as a leader of the democracy, and like his master, Peel, no friend of the landed interest: "the same origin & the same illness doth attend on it—in the shape of a suspicious jealousy of his betters however much his inferiors. . . . I believe him nothing loath to do the worst."⁵

Sneyd did not live to see the worst, even as he might construe it. But he saw rightly, in the last decade of his life, that the age of the "Landed Ascendancy" was at an end.⁶ New forms of wealth—urban, commercial and manufacturing—had come to hold a preponderance in English life, and Sneyd took little joy in the sight. In this he was different from many landed gentlemen who were exhilarated by the spectacle of urban trade and manufacture. They had quickly got over their alarm at the coming of the railway, discovering that the new means of transport was useful to the economy of the landed estate. Their mines

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 13 March (?) 1859.

² Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 3 March 1859.

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 27 February 1860.

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 25 April 1851.

⁵ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 14 March 1854.

⁶ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 13 March (?) 1859.

benefitted and so did their farming. And when towns grew and trade flourished, when a new age was signalized by the Crystal Palace Exhibition, not a few landed gentlemen were full of pride and enthusiasm. It was not uncommon in every corner of agricultural England for landowners to send their dependants up to London to stare at Paxton's glass house and its wonderful contents.

But for Sneyd such things were as dust and ashes in his mouth. "Those devices of the devil",¹ he called the railways. "That foul smithy" was his form of address for that Newcastle which lay close to his estate—"black & dismal & filthy enough to be a first-rate Manufacturing Town".² Nor did London give him much pleasure. The noise appalled him: "I cannot close my eyes in noise! I really dread it. Under any circumstances London is repugnant to me".³ As for the Crystal Palace Exhibition, Sneyd curtly dismissed it: "That great unwieldy plaything of Prince Albert's."⁴ For all he knew it might benefit trade but what had it to do with landed gentlemen? "By all means let Trade have it—and Trade is quite rich enough to pay for it—but to go begging to the Land which it has just succeeded in half-ruining to pay the piper for its dance is rather too bad."⁵ Unfortunately, as Sneyd knew too well, there was no getting away from the unpleasant fact that the Land and its traditional society were ultimately fated to pay the piper for the dance of Trade.

V

Yet with all his fatalism Sneyd carried on. However clearly his intellect saw that his society and class were declining, his instincts led him to make the best of it, to make do in the midst of a world that he had learned to detest. Thus outwardly it appeared that the master of Keele was no different from a good Whig nobleman like Earl Fitzwilliam whose philosophy was more in tune with the chief tendencies of the age. To have

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 18 October 1842.

² Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 26 May 1836.

³ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 24 May 1863.

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, February 1850.

⁵ Ibid.

looked at Keele in the last twenty years of Sneyd's life, one might well have taken its owner for an optimist, a believer in progress, a staunch improver, a prudent businessman. The estate presented a bustling, prosperous scene. There was a stir of activity as resourceful tenants went in for the new husbandry, and the face of the land bore the marks of skilful cultivation. And up at the big house, the squire was once more at his planting and building.

Sneyd emerged from the crisis in his financial affairs with flying colours. However much he distrusted his abilities as a man of business, however great his distaste for practical affairs, he managed to do the right things. He consolidated his debts at a lower rate of interest by borrowing a large sum of money (£130,000) from the Equitable Assurance. He hired the services of a professional auditor from Birmingham who periodically inspected the accounts of the estate. He gave up the vocation of ironmaster by leasing the works and thereby freeing himself from an unpleasant and unprofitable responsibility. And, what was probably most important, he employed a new agent, Andrew Thompson, a Scot, who came of a large farming family, had several brothers who were themselves land agents, and had himself been in the employ of Charles Arbuthnot, the old Tory officeholder who owned a small estate in Northamptonshire. Arbuthnot regretted seeing Thompson go; but had no wish to stand in his way. His merits were such that he deserved rather to "be agent to some one of great landed property than to remain with me".¹

Andrew Thompson was indeed a prize. He was one of that great line of Victorian land agents who were skilled in every department of their versatile profession, proud, responsible, intelligent men, who sought nothing better than to serve their masters well by serving the land of England well. By the sixties Thompson had made Keele into a model estate worked by good tenants according to the most advanced principles and methods.² He took upon his own shoulders the responsibility

¹ Sneyd MSS., C. Arbuthnot to R. Sneyd, 23 June 1848.

² See Evershed, "Staffordshire Agriculture", *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society*, 1869.

for decisions about the coal mines and about the sale of building land—matters which Sneyd found distasteful.¹ Few things, however, were more important for the finances of Keele. The income from Sneyd's mines rose steadily, and the increase in the value of land for building was equally substantial. Thompson showed himself an astute man of business, and Keele's affairs prospered in the last decade of Sneyd's life as they had never prospered since the day he succeeded his father.²

With all this Sneyd had little to do, beyond making sure that his agents were competent and trustworthy. Once done it was not long before the great passion of his life claimed him again. In January 1855 he announced to Henry Vincent that "to build is an unavoidable necessity. . . . I have now so developed the *Place*, that a *House*, more in correspondence with it, has become a positive want in my picture. I have for 24 years made it my chief amusement to work out this picture, & to leave it incomplete in so essential an item is flatly impossible."³ Sneyd at once brought in the architect Salvin, and he and Vincent were soon busy discussing the merits of Salvin's plans. The architect had put in a "heavy squat tower" in the wrong place; Sneyd altered its position and raised it fifteen feet. Salvin objected to the dismemberment of some of his arches but Sneyd insisted and got his way, thinking all the time that Salvin was sound but needed watching.⁴ There was no end of fascination for Sneyd in the watching, as the old Elizabethan mansion was re-built in red sandstone, enriched and enlarged, but following the general outlines of the original house. It helped a good deal, one suspects, to make Sneyd forget how much better off his ancestor and namesake had been. The age of Elizabeth had known no Reform Bills, no Mr. Gladstone, no Crystal Palace Exhibition.

Thus, as he brooded over the state of England, Sneyd went on with his planting and his building, as his ancestors had done for centuries before him. The landed interest might be close

¹ Sneyd MSS., A. Thompson to R. Sneyd, 10 December 1858.

² By the seventies the estate income had more than doubled over that of 1829.

³ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 11 January 1855.

⁴ Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 15 January 1855.

to death, but the Sneyds and Keele prospered and flourished, and the pride of family was still very much alive. Sneyd, the bachelor, sighed with disappointment when his brother's wife gave birth to a girl: "Vanity of vanities it may be—but one does not willingly foresee the extinction of one's race."¹ So long as the sentiment of family was strong, landed gentlemen would take a deal of killing. As Sneyd once said: "one repeats some pregnant passage of Burke—& sighs—& grumbles—but does one's duty".²

¹ Sneyd MSS., R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 8 January 1863.

² Ibid. R. Sneyd to H. Vincent, 26 March 1835.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(List of Books presented to the Library by the Publisher or the Author.)

GENERAL WORKS, BIBLIOGRAPHY, ART, Etc.

ANTON BRUCKNERS SYMPHONIEN : Untersuchung über Formenbau und Stimmlungsgehalt. Von *Ilmari Krohn*. I, Symph. 1-3. Helsinki, [Suomalaisen Tiedekateman Toimituksia, 86], 1955. 8vo, pp. 370. *Wrappers*.

BEITRÄGE ZUR KUNSTPFLEGE in Erlangen. Erlangen, Selbstverlag des Kunstvereins, 1954. 8vo, pp. 120. *Wrappers. Illustrated*.

BIBLIOGRAPHICA HIBERNICA : additions and corrections to Wing. By *John Alden*. Charlottesville, Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1955. 8vo, pp. 39. *Wrappers*.

BIBLIOTHECA VAN DER LINDE-NIEMEIJERIANA : a catalogue of the chess collection in the Royal Library, the Hague. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 1955. 8vo, pp. xi, 342. *Wrappers*.

BIBLIOTHEKSFÜHRER DER STADT HALLE, SAALE : ein Wegweiser durch hallesche Bibliotheken. Halle, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek [Schriften zum Bibliotheks- und Büchereiwesen, 11], 1955. 8vo, pp. 40. *Wrappers*.

BIBLIOTHEKSPRAXIS, BIBLIOPHILIE UND ERZIEHUNGSGEWESEN in den Vereinigten Staaten. Drei Vorträge, gehalten von *Henry Miller Madden*. Wien, Vereinigung Österreichischer Bibliothekare [Biblos-Schriften, 8], 1955. 8vo, pp. x, 66. *Wrappers*.

BOOKBINDERS OF NORTHUMBERLAND AND DURHAM. By *William S. Mitchell*. Gateshead on Tyne, Northumberland Press, Ltd., 1955. 8vo. *Wrappers. Illustrated*.

CATALOGUE OF BOOKS & MANUSCRIPTS in the Estelle Doheny collection. Pt. 3. Los Angeles, Edward L. Doheny Memorial Library, 1955. 4to, pp. xii, 170. *Illustrated*.

CATALOGUS DER NIET-NEDERLANDSE DRUKKEN, 1500-1540, aanwezig in de Koninklijke Bibliotheek 's-Gravenhage. Door *R. Pennink*. 's-Gravenhage, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 1955. 8vo, pp. xviii, 267. *Wrappers*.

FORMENWANDLUNGEN DER &-ZEICHEN. Von *Jan Tschichold*. Frankfurt am Main, D. Stempel AG, [1955?]. 8vo, pp. 24. *Wrappers. Illustrated*.

GREEK LITERARY HANDS, 350 B.C.-A.D. 400. By *C. H. Roberts*. Oxford, Clarendon Press [Oxford Palaeographical Handbooks], 1955. 8vo, pp. xix, 24. *Facsimiles. 30s.*

GUIDE TO THE MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION in the Toronto Public Libraries. Toronto, Public Libraries, 1954. 8vo, pp. 116. *Wrappers*.

A HISTORY OF SCOTTISH BOOKBINDING, 1432 to 1650. By *William Smith Mitchell*. Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd [Aberdeen University Studies, 134], [1955]. 8vo, pp. xii, 150. *Illustrated. 42s.*

LIVERPOOL PUBLIC LIBRARIES. CATALOGUE of the Music Library. Liverpool, Public Libraries, 1954. 8vo, pp. 572. *Wrappers.* 21s.

DIE PAPYRUSSAMMLUNG DER ÖSTERREICHISCHEN NATIONALBIBLIOTHEK. Mit einem Katalog der ständigen Ausstellung. Von Herbert Klos. Wien Vereinigung Österreichischer Bibliothekare [Biblos-Schriften, 9], 1955, 8vo, pp. ix, 32, xvi. *Wrappers. Facsimiles.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY, 1954. London, Geoffrey Cumberlege, [1955]. 8vo, pp. xii, 286. *Illustrated.*

TERENCE ILLUSTRATED: AN EXHIBITION in honor of Karl Ephraim Weston. With an essay by Mary L. Richmond. Williamstown, Mass., Chapin Library, 1955. 8vo, pp. 43. *Wrappers. Illustrated.*

RIJKSMUSEUM, AMSTERDAM. LE TRIOMPHE DU MANIÉRISME EUROPÉEN de Michel-Ange au Gréco. Seconde exposition. Catalogue. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, 1955. 8vo, pp. 244,107. *Wrappers. Illustrated.*

WALT WHITMAN: A CATALOG based upon the collections of the Library of Congress. With notes on Whitman collections and collectors. Washington, Library of Congress, 1955. 8vo, pp. xviii, 147. *Wrappers. 65 cents.*

HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

THE CRISIS OF THE EARLY ITALIAN RENAISSANCE: civic humanism and republican liberty in an age of classicism and tyranny. By Hans Baron. Princeton, University Press, 1955. 2 vols. 8vo. *Illustrated. \$10.00.*

L'ESCLAVAGE DANS L'EUROPE MÉDIÉVALE. Tome I. Par Charles Verlinden. Brugge, "De Tempel" [Rijksuniversiteit te Gent. Werken uiteergegeven door de Faculteit van de Letteren en Wijsbegeerte, 119], 1955. 8vo, pp. 929. *Wrappers.*

ESPAÑA Y AMERICA. Por Eugenio Maria de Hostos. (Obras completas. Vol. 21.) Recopilacion y arreglo por Eugenio Carlos de Hostos. Paris, [Ediciones Literarias y Artísticas, 1954]. 8vo, pp. xxix, 627.

GEORGE JAMES TURNER, 1867-1946. By Sir Cecil Carr. London, Geoffrey Cumberlege for the British Academy, [1955]. 8vo. *Wrappers. Portrait. 2s. 6d.*

HOSTOS, PEREGRINO DEL IDEAL: ideario y trabajos acerca de Eugenio María de Hostos, y apendice, recogidos y publicados por Eugenio Carlos de Hostos. Paris, [Ediciones Literarias y Artísticas, 1954]. 8vo, pp. 461. *Portrait.*

JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MASSACHUSETTS. Vol. 30. 1753-1754. Published at the charge of the W. B. H. Dowse Fund. Boston, Massachusetts Historical Society, 1955. 8vo, pp. xii, 297. *Facsimile reprint.*

SERBIA BETWEEN EAST AND WEST: the events of 1903-1908. By Wayne S. Vucinich. Stanford, University Press [University Series. History, Economics and Political Science, 9], 1954. 8vo, pp. x, 304. *Wrappers. Map. \$4.75.*

HET THORBECKE-ARCHIEF, 1798-1872. Uitgegeven door *J. Brandt-Van der Veen*. Eerste deel, 1798-1820. Utrecht, Kemink en Zoon N.V. [Werken uitgegeven door het Historisch Genootschap, 4e serie, 3], 1955. 8vo, pp. xvii, 443. *Wrappers. Illustrated.*

WILLIAM ROSCOE OF LIVERPOOL. By *George Chandler*. Introduction by *Sir Alfred Shennan*. London, B. T. Batsford, Ltd., [1953]. 8vo, pp. xxxvi, 470. *Illustrated. Édition de luxe, £15 15s. (Library edition, 25s).*

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

AESTHETICISM AND OSCAR WILDE. Part 2. Literary style. By *Aatos Ojala*. Helsinki, [Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia, 93, ii], 1955. 8vo, pp. 270. *Wrappers.*

AUGERIUS GISLENUS BUSBEQUIUS, 1522-1591: vlaams humanist en keizerlijk gezant. Hulde bij het vierde eeuwfeest van het begin van zijn gezantschap in het oosten, 1554-1954. Brussel, Paleis der Academiën, [1955]. 4to, pp. 118. *Wrappers. Illustrated.*

A BOOK ON THE DANISH WRITER HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN: his life and work. Published on the 150th anniversary of his birth. Copenhagen, det Berlingske Bogtrykkeri, 1955. 8vo, pp. 219. *Wrappers. Illustrated.*

DE MARTIALIS EPIGR. VIII, 15, COMMENTATIUNCULA. Scripsit *Erik Wistrand*. Göteborg, Wettergren & Kerbers Förlag [Göteborgs Universitets Årsskrift, 60, ix], 1954. 8vo, pp. 40. *Wrappers. Kr. 8.*

DE VERGILI ECLOGA SEXTA COMMENTATIO. Scripsit *Janus Bernardus Evenhuis*. Hagae Comitis, "Excelsior", 1955. 8vo, pp. 66. *Wrappers.*

DON MIGUEL DE UNAMUNO Y SUS POESIAS: estudio y antología de textos poéticos no incluidos en sus libros. *Manuel García Blanco*. Salamanca, Universidad [Acta Salmanticensia: Filosofía y Letras, 8], 1954. 8vo, pp. 453. *Wrappers.*

DRYDEN AND THE ART OF TRANSLATION. By *William Frost*. New Haven, Yale University Press [Yale Studies in English, 128], 1955. 8vo, pp. 100. \$3.50.

ETYMOLOGISCHE UNTERSUCHUNG ÜBER ESTNISCHE ORTSNAMEN. Von *Lauri Kettunen*. Helsinki, [Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia, 90, i], 1955. 8vo, pp. xxiv, 437. *Wrappers. Map.*

EΠΑΛΟΙΑ: études épigraphiques. Par *Nils Sandberg*. Göteborg, Wettergren & Kerbers Förlag [Göteborgs Universitets Årsskrift, 60, viii], 1954. 8vo, pp. 43. *Wrappers. Kr. 6.*

HOMER AND HIS FORERUNNERS. By *Sir Maurice Bowra*. Being the Andrew Lang lecture delivered before the University of St. Andrews, 16 February 1955. Edinburgh, T. Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1955. 8vo, pp. 41. *Wrappers. 4s. 6d.*

AN INTRODUCTION TO EARLY NEW HIGH GERMAN. By *Kenneth Brooke*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1955. 8vo, pp. lxviii, 155. 25s.

IRRTUM UND MISSVERSTÄNDNIS in den Dichtungen Heinrich von Kleists. Von Helmut Prang. Erlangen, Universitäts-bund [Erlanger Forschungen. Reihe A. Bd. 5], 1955. 8vo, pp. 66. Wrappers. DM. 5.00.

JAPANESE LITERATURE IN THE MEIJI ERA. Compiled and edited by Okazaki Yoshie. Translated and adapted by V. H. Viglielmo. Tokyo, Obunsha [Centenary Cultural Council Series], 1955. 8vo, pp. xiv. 673. Illustrated. 72s.

JOHN HART'S WORKS ON ENGLISH ORTHOGRAPHY and pronunciation, 1551, 1569, 1570. Part I. Biographical and bibliographical introductions, texts and index verborum. By Bror Danielsson. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell [Stockholm Studies in English, 5], 1955. 8vo, pp. 338. Wrappers. Facsimiles. Kr. 38.

KLOPSTOCK: der heilige Dichter. Von Max Freivogel. Bern. Verlag Francke AG, 1954. 8vo, pp. 159. Wrappers.

LORENZO VALLA: filologia e storia nell'umanesimo italiano. Franco Gaeta. Napoli, Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici, 1955. 8vo, pp. 260. Wrappers. L. 1400.

THE MAJOR SATIRES OF ALEXANDER POPE. By Robert W. Rogers. Urbana, University of Illinois Press [Studies in Language and Literature, 40], 1955. 8vo, pp. ix, 163. Wrappers. \$3.00.

MITTELHOCHDEUTSCH WURPÖZ 'RADIX', BÖZE 'FLACHSBUNDDEL', BÖZ 'STOSS': Geographie und Etymologie. Von Torsten Dahlberg. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell [Göteborgs Universitets Årsskrift, 61, i], 1955. 8vo, pp. 52. Wrappers. Plans. Kr. 7.

NOMBRES VASCOS DE LAS PLANTAS. Por K. Bouda y D. Baumgartl. Salamanca, Universidad [Acta Salmanticensia: Filosofía y Letras, 7, iii], 1955. 8vo, pp. 99. Wrappers.

DIE PRAEFATIO DES POMPEIUS TROGUS. Von Otto Seel. Erlangen, Universitätsbund [Erlanger Forschungen. Reihe A. Bd. 3], 1955. 8vo, pp. 86. Wrappers. DM. 8.00.

RELIGION AND ART OF WILLIAM HALE WHITE, "Mark Rutherford". By Wilfred Stone. Stanford, University Press [University Series. Language and Literature, 12], 1954. 8vo, pp. viii, 240. Wrappers. \$3.00.

RUSKIN'S LETTERS FROM VENICE, 1851-1852. By John Lewis Bradley. New Haven, Yale University Press [Yale Studies in English, 129], 1955. 8vo, pp. xx, 330. \$5.00.

SIX FAIRY TALES by the Danish writer Hans Christian Andersen, published on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth. Copenhagen, det Berlingske Bogtrykkeri, 1955. 8vo, pp. 70. Wrappers. Illustrated.

LA TONÉTIQUE DES LANGUES BANTU et Semi-Bantu du Cameroun. Par R. P. A. Stoll. Douala, Institut Français d'Afrique Noire [Memorandum, 4], 1955. 8vo, pp. 171. Wrappers.

UNPUBLISHED LETTERS of *Thomas De Quincey* and *Elizabeth Barrett Browning*. Edited from the originals in the Grey collection, Auckland Public Library, by *S. Musgrove*. Auckland, University College [Bulletin, 44. English series, 7], 1954. 8vo, pp. 37. *Wrappers*.

LE VERBE ROUMAIN : étude morphologique. Par *Alf Lombard*. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup [Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfun det i Lund, 52, i, ii], 1954-55. 2 vols. 8vo. *Wrappers*. Kr. 100.

W. P. KER AS A CRITIC OF LITERATURE. The sixteenth W. P. Ker Memorial Lecture delivered in the University of Glasgow, 4th November, 1954. By *B. Ifor Evans*, Glasgow, Jackson, Son & Company [Glasgow University Publications, 100], 1955. 8vo, pp. 25. *Wrappers*. 4s.

WACHSTUM UND WANDLUNGEN im neuesten italienischen Wortschatz. Von *Albert Junker*. Erlangen, Universitätsbund [Erlanger Forschungen. Reihe A. Bd. 2], 1955. 8vo, pp. 230. *Wrappers*. DM. 24.00.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

ABHIDHAMMAPITAKA. Vol. 7. Patthānappakaraṇam. Pts. 3, 4. Edited by *Pandita Kirielle Nanawimala Thero*. Maradana, Colombo, Anula Press [Sripada Tripitaka Series, 10, 11], 1954-55. 2 vols. 8vo. *Wrappers*. Rup. 12.00.

AGAPÈ : prolégomènes à une étude de théologie néo-testamentaire. Par *C. Spicq*. Louvain, E. Nauwelaerts [Studia Hellenistica, 10], 1955. 8vo, pp. xii, 227. *Wrappers*.

ATHENA PARTHENOS AND ATHENA POLIAS : a study in the religion of Periclean Athens. By *C. J. Herington*. Manchester, University Press [Faculty of Arts Publications, 7], [1955]. 4to, pp. v, 70. *Plan*. 10s. 6d.

THE BIBLE TODAY : historical, social, and literary aspects of the Old and New Testaments. Described by Christian scholars. London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, for *The Times*, 1955. 8vo, pp. xv, 208. *Illustrated*. 25s.

CARL FRIEDRICH AUGUST WEIBEZAHN : der Osnabrücker Erweckungsprediger. Von *Walter Schäfer*. Osnabrück, Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte, 1955. 8vo, pp. 48. *Wrappers*.

DIE CISTERCIENSERABTEI HIMMEROD im Spätmittelalter. Von *Ambrosius Schneider*. Himmerod, Selbstverlag der Abtei [Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Mittelrheinischen Kirchengeschichte, 1], 1954. 8vo, pp. xx, 284. *Illustrated*.

COMPLETING THE REFORMATION : the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. By *William Robinson*. Lexington, Kentucky, The College of the Bible [Spring Lectures, 1955], 1955. 8vo, pp. 70. *Wrappers*. \$1.00.

CONCERNING THE WHITE HORSE in the Apocalypse, chap. xix, from the Arcana caelestia by *Emanuel Swedenborg*, being a translation of his work, "De equo albo . . . Londini, 1758". London, The Swedenborg Society, 1955. 8vo, pp. v, 53. 2s. 6d.

EPISTOLA SANCTI IACOBI. Introductio et commentarius. *Theophilus Garcia ab Orbiso*. Romae, Pontificium Athenaeum Lateranense [Lateranum, N.S. 20], 1954. 8vo, pp. xv, 291. *Wrappers*.

A HISTORY OF THE LANCASHIRE CONGREGATIONAL UNION, 1806-1956. Prepared, to commemorate the triple jubilee of the Union, by *W. Gordon Robinson*. Manchester, Lancashire Congregational Union, [1955]. 8vo, pp. 186. Illustrated. 6s.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE GOSPEL LAW and Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, both in extenso . . . and a supplementary monograph on baptism, by *Apostolos Makrakis*. Translated out of the original Greek by *D. Cummings*. Chicago, The Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1955. 8vo, pp. iii, 136, 314. Illustrated.

LE FLORILÈGE CYRILLIEN réfuté par *Sévère d'Antioche*: étude et édition critique. Par *Robert Hespel*. Louvain, Publications Universitaires [Bibliothèque du Muséon, 37], 1955. 8vo, pp. xx, 258. Wrappers. Fr. bel. 300.

EEN JAVAANSE PRIMBON uit de zestiende eeuw: opnieuw uitgegeven en vertaald door *G. W. J. Drewes*. Leiden, E. J. Brill [Uitgaven van de Stichting de Goeje, 15], 1954. 8vo, pp. 157. Wrappers.

JOHANNES REUCHLIN, 1455-1522. Festgabe seiner Vaterstadt Pforzheim zur 500. Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages. Herausgegeben von *Manfred Krebs*. Pforzheim, Selbstverlag der Stadt, [1955], 4to, pp. 265. Illustrated.

KANT'S METAPHYSICS AND THEORY OF SCIENCE. By *Gottfried Martin*. Translated from the German by *P. G. Lucas*. Manchester, University Press, [1955], 8vo, pp. viii, 218. 21s.

LE LIVRE DE JOSUÉ. Première partie: L'invasion, chapitre 1-12. Texte, traduction, commentaire. *Louis Roussel*. Nîmes, Imprimerie Barnier [Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Montpellier, 8], [1955?]. 8vo, pp. 141. Wrappers. Fr. 700.

A MIDDLE ENGLISH METRICAL PARAPHRASE of the Old Testament. Vol. 2. Edited by *Urban Ohlander*. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell [Göteborgs Universitets Årsskrift, 61, ii], 1955. 8vo, pp. 111. Wrappers. Kr. 12.

"OF A TRUTH THE LORD HATH SENT ME": an inquiry into the source of the prophet's authority. By *Sheldon H. Blank*. Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press [Samuel H. Goldenson Lecture, 1955], [1955]. 8vo, pp. 17. Wrappers.

THE PARISH CHURCH OF THE HOLY TRINITY, St. Andrews. Pre-reformation. With appendices. By *W. E. K. Rankin*. Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd [St. Andrews University Publications, 52], [1955]. 8vo, pp. xii, 153. Illustrated. 15s.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF JONATHAN EDWARDS, from his private notebooks. Edited by *Harvey G. Townsend*. Oregon, University Press [Studies in Philosophy, 2], 1955. 8vo, pp. xxii, 270. Wrappers. \$3.50.

THE PROPHETIC FAITH OF OUR FATHERS: the historical development of prophetic interpretation. By *Leroy Edwin Froom*. Washington, Review and Herald, [1946-54]. 4 vols. 8vo. Illustrated. \$34.00.

STUDIA ISLAMICA. Collegerunt *R. Brunschwig, J. Schacht*. Vol. 4. Paris, Larose, 1955. 8vo, pp. 142. Wrappers.

TOLERANZ UND CHRISTLICHER GLAUBE. Von *Albert Hartmann*. Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Josef Knecht Carolusdruckerei, [1955]. 8vo, pp. 281.

DE VERHOUDING TUSSEN ZIJN EN WEZENHEID en de transcendentele relatie in de 2e helft der XIIIe eeuw. Door *A. Pattin*. Brussel, Paleis der Academiën [Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie. Verhandelingen. Klasse der Letteren, 21], 1955. 4to, pp. 311. *Wrappers*.

WIR HABEN DAS ECHTE NEUE TESTAMENT. Von *Johannes Bröhl*. Mainz, Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, [1955]. 8vo, pp. 56. *Wrappers. Illustrated*.

SOCIOLOGY

"... THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY..." Addresses delivered at Washington University during the Second Century Convocation. St. Louis, Miss., Washington University, 1955. 8vo, pp. 90. *Wrappers. Portraits*.

THE BRITISH UNIVERSITY SYSTEM, 1914-1954. The P. J. Anderson Memorial Lecture, 1954. By *Sir Hector Hetherington, K.B.E.* Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd [Aberdeen University Studies, 133], [1955]. 8vo, pp. 13. *Wrappers. 1s.*

DAVID HUME: WRITINGS ON ECONOMICS. Edited and introduced by *Eugene Rotwein*. Edinburgh, Nelson, 1955. 8vo, pp. cxi, 224. *Frontispiece. 30s.*

EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIP IN AFRICA and the West Indies. By *Lilian M. Penson*. Glasgow, Jackson, Son & Company [Glasgow University Publications. The Montague Burton Lectures], 1955. 8vo, pp. 25. *Wrappers. 1s.*

THE FEDERAL ANTITRUST POLICY: organisation of an American tradition. By *Hans B. Thorelli*. Stockholm, Kungliga Boktryckeriet P.A. Norstedt & Söner, 1954. 8vo, pp. xvi, 658. *Wrappers. Kr. 39.*

A HISTORY OF THE CUTLERY INDUSTRY in the Connecticut Valley. By *Martha Van Hoesen Taber*. Northampton, Mass., Smith College [Studies in History, 41], 1955. 8vo, pp. vi, 138. *Wrappers. \$2.00.*

HISTORY OF THE FOUNDATION AND THE RISE of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense, 1517-1550. By *Henry de Vocht*. Pt. 3. Louvain, Publications Universitaires [Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, 4e série, 5], 1954. 8vo, pp. xii, 670. *Wrappers.*

MARGRIETA BEER, 1871-1951: a memoir. By *Dorothea Waley Singer*. Manchester, University Press, [1955]. 8vo, pp. 81. *Portrait. 6s. 6d.*

DIE MATRIKEL DES GYMNASIUM CASIMIRIANUM ACADEMICUM zu Coburg, 1606-1803. Von *Curt Hoefner*. Lieferung I. Würzburg, Kommissionsverlag Ferdinand Schöningh [Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft für Fränkische Geschichte. IV. Reihe. Bd. 6], 1955. 8vo, pp. 80. *Wrappers.*

DER RECHTSVERLUST IM MOBILIARSACHENRECHT: ein Beitrag zur Begründung und Begrenzung des sachenrechtlichen Vertrauensschutzes. Von *Heinz Hübner*. Erlangen, Universitätsbund [Erlanger Forschungen. Reihe A. Bd. 4], 1955. 8vo, pp. 152. *Wrappers. DM. 12.80.*